National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, EDITOR. Without Concealment....Without Compromise. EDMUND QUINCY, JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, } CORRESPONDING EDITORS.

VOL. XI....NO. 17. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1850. WHOLE NO. 537.

Published Weekly,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY
AT 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK.
TERMS:
TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to S. H. GAY, New York.

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY may be forwarded to FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer, at Boston; or S. H. GAY, New York.

Norris & Brother, Printers.

Selections.

THE FUGITIVE-SLAVE BILL.

MR. DAVIS'S AMENDMENT TO PROTECT FREE MEN OF COLOR.

U. S. Senate, Friday, August 23, 1850.

Mr. DAVIS, of Massachusetts moved to amend the bill by adding the following as an additional section:

SEC.—*And be it further enacted*, That if any mariner or other free colored person arriving on board of any vessel in any port or place in the United States, shall be imprisoned or deprived of his liberty without any alleged crime or offence against law, it shall in all such cases be the duty of the District Attorney of the United States within and for the district where such imprisonment or detention may occur, to cause any such person so imprisoned or detained, to be brought by writ of habeas corpus before the circuit or district judge of such district, and it shall be the duty of the judge before whom any such person is brought, to inquire into and decide whether such imprisonment or detention is lawful, and if he find the same to be unlawful, he shall thereupon discharge from custody any such person. And the necessary charges incurred in suing out such process and prosecuting the same, shall be paid by the United States, in the same manner as similar charges are now allowed in criminal prosecutions.

Mr. DAVIS, of Massachusetts: I have been desirous that the bill should be matured, so as to take the form in which it will be submitted for our votes, before I should offer the proposition which has just been read. This amendment speaks for itself, and shows pretty distinctly what the object is.

No modification of the bill is proposed, but a distinct matter making another section. Several of the Southern States in which Slavery exists, have enacted laws by which they authorize officers of their own, whenever a vessel arrives from without any such State, to visit her, and to take into custody such free colored persons as are found on board, as mariners or otherwise, and commit them to prison, where they are to remain while the vessel lies in port. The colored portion of the crew is thus taken away, and the master is required to pay the expenses of detention in prison before they are restored. This has been the cause of very serious complaint, both on the part of those who are confined and of the navigators who employ them, and representations of the abuse have frequently been made to the Government of Massachusetts, asking them for the interference of that State so far as to protect them against this agression on their rights. In order to show the true state of this question, and the necessity for some provision on the part of Congress, I must enter into a brief explanation of what has occurred between the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and South Carolina. Vessels from Massachusetts, in the prosecution of ordinary commercial business, visited the port of Charleston in South Carolina, and the free colored persons on board were, by a law of this description, taken out and placed in confinement there. The Legislature of Massachusetts listened to the complaints, and deemed it their duty to make some provision to bring the question which existed between the States to an issue in the courts of justice.

The question at issue was this: The State of Massachusetts admits this class of persons to be citizens of the commonwealth. They are treated as such, have the right of voting, and all other rights of citizenship. South Carolina denies that they are citizens of that State, and on this founds a right to seize and punish them, without any allegation of crime or misconduct. The Constitution of the United States declares that the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of the several States. The question then arises, is a citizen of Massachusetts entitled in South Carolina to the privileges and immunites of a citizen of that State? This being denied, the State of Massachusetts thought it to be her duty to institute some means of inquiring into this subject, and causing a judicial investigation to settle and determine whether or not it was legal and lawful to subject these individuals to this confinement on the ground that they are not citizens. They accordingly authorized the Governor to appoint an agent in the State of South Carolina, and in any other place where these occurrences took place, to bring that question before the tribunals of the United States, in order that a decision might be had. The Governor appointed, as agent in South Carolina for that purpose, a highly respectable professional gentleman, in the city of Charleston, who declined accepting the office. The Governor then appointed another gentleman of the bar in the same city, who also declined accepting the office. He therefore appointed an eminent citizen of Massachusetts, and sent him there for this purpose. Well, sir, in order that there might be no misapprehension or misunderstanding, this gentleman on his arrival, addressed a letter to the Governor of South Carolina stating the object of his visit. The following is the letter:

"CHARLESTON, November 28, 1844.

"SIR: Your Excellency is already informed of remonstrances made by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts against the arrest and imprisonment of her citizens in South Carolina, against whom the commission of no crime is alleged. The Legislature of Massachusetts has recently passed a resolve authorizing the Governor of the State to appoint an agent 'for the purpose of collecting and transmitting accurate information respecting the number and the names of citizens of Massachusetts who have heretofore been, or may be, during the period of the engagement of the agent, imprisoned without the allegation of any crime.' The agent is also authorized to bring and prosecute one or more suits in behalf of any citizen that may be so imprisoned at the expense of Massachusetts, for the purpose of having the legality of such imprisonment tried and determined in the Supreme Court of the United States.

"The Governor of Massachusetts has appointed me an agent of that State to execute the purposes above mentioned, and I arrived in this city this morning for that purpose.

"I do not know that your Excellency will consider it proper in any way to notice this subject, yet propriety seemed to require this communication.

With great respect, your Excellency's ob't serv't,
"SAMUEL HOAR.

"His Excellency J. H. HAMMOND,
"Governor of South Carolina."

Well, sir, the Governor of South Carolina, instead of returning an answer to this individual, laid the subject before the Legislature, and the populace of Charleston took it up also, without waiting for the action of the Governor or any other authority. I will not enter more particularly into details of the occurrences at Charleston, but this gentleman, as he states in his official report, was compelled from what was done and said to leave the place. The Legislature of South Carolina immediately took up the message of the Governor communicating the letter of the agent, and passed certain resolutions in relation to this subject, amongst which was one authorizing the Governor to expel this individual from the State. The following are the resolutions:—

"1. *Resolved*, That the right to exclude from their territories seditious persons or others, whose presence may be dangerous to their peace, is essential to every independent State.

"2. *Resolved*, That free negroes and persons of color are not citizens of the United States within the meaning of the Constitution, which confers upon the citizens of one State the privileges and immunities of the citizens of the several States.

"3. *Resolved*, That the emissary sent by the State of Massachusetts to the State of South Carolina, with the avowed purpose of interfering with her institutions and disturbing her peace, is to be regarded in the character he has assumed, and to be treated accordingly.

"4. *Resolved*, That his excellency the Governor be requested to expel from our territory the said agent, after due notice to depart, and that the Legislature will sustain the Executive authority in any measure it may adopt for the purpose aforesaid."

They also passed an extraordinary law, in addition to existing laws, which, if I can rightly understand the substance of it, is, that it shall be criminal for any person to undertake to obstruct, or hinder, or interfere with the operation of the laws of South Carolina by which individuals are confined, or, in other words, precluding these individuals from the right of having this question settled in the courts of justice.

In addition to this, there is an act denying the right of such person to the writ of habeas corpus.—There the question stands from that day to this. The doors of the courts of justice are effectually closed, and apparently forever closed. There the question, I say, stands—upon these facts and these laws, which exist in South Carolina and elsewhere, and are enforced against persons of this description. Thus far there have been no means of bringing to the test the validity of such laws. While South Carolina denies that people of this description are citizens entitled to the privileges conferred by the Constitution, Massachusetts and many other States admit them to the rights of citizens. They test them as such, and they claim that the provisions of the Constitution extend to and embrace them, and being citizens of Massachusetts, they of right may claim the privileges and immunities of citizens of South Carolina, or in any other State that belongs to the Union.

All that I wish to state, at this late hour of the day, is, that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has been anxious to do one single thing, and nothing else; and that is, to submit this question to the tribunal which the Constitution has provided for its final settlement. She is anxious for nothing but that the question be submitted to the tribunal which the Constitution has provided, and that that tribunal should settle it by deciding whether or not these laws of other States are constitutional. If they are decided to be constitutional acts then she will acquiesce in such decision. If, on the contrary, they are not constitutional acts—if they are in violation of the rights of these citizens, then it seems to me only fair and just that the doors of the courts which are now closed should be opened, and the question should be brought to a determination, that they may know what their rights are. I might enter more largely into this question, and discuss the question of citizenship, but it has really nothing to do with this simple act of legislation. I do not propose to settle the question here, but to provide that it may be settled by the proper judicial tribunal. My amendment proposes that, and nothing else. It provides that it shall be the duty of the district attorney, where persons of this description are seized and imprisoned, in the manner described, by a writ of habeas corpus to bring them before the district or circuit court, and let the question be decided there, at the expense of the United States Government; which is, it seems to me, very reasonable, because the Senate well knows, without my stating it, the fact that these colored persons, who ordinarily go out as cooks and in other subordinate capacities on board vessels are quite incapable of asserting their own rights; and it seems but just towards them that the United States should do it. It is due to Massachusetts, and other States which have similar causes of complaint; and now is the time and this is the place to do justice and allay excitement in all quarters.

Mr. Butler. I am not prepared, I must confess, to enter upon the discussion of this subject this evening, but if allowed time, I believe I can fully vindicate the laws of the State which I in part represent. Indeed, I have once before argued this same question. To say as has been boldly said here, that it is in the power of Massachusetts to make citizens and give them rights in South Carolina different from what persons of a similar character in that State would have, is a proposition calculated to arrest marked attention, and to startle the public mind in the States which entertain a different notion on the subject. But first, let me ask, why is this proposition directed particularly to South Carolina, or to the Southern States alone? I understand that Illinois and some other of the Northwestern States, have in their constitutions prohibitory clauses, denying to persons of this character the right to become citizens; and why not refer to them also? It is true that the constitution declares that the citizens of one State shall enjoy all the privileges and immunities of the citizens of another State; but I assert here that there can be no such thing as making a colored man a citizen of South Carolina. By the laws of South Carolina no such person is capable of attaining that *status*. A free man of color there may and does possess many civil rights. He can sue and be sued, has the benefit of the writ of habeas corpus, and has the right of holding property the same as a white man—and, by the by, many of them hold slaves there. In fact, he has all the rights, except what may be called the complete right of citizenship. And this right the legislation of no other State can give him in the State of South Carolina. There can be no such thing, therefore, as one State making citizens of a particular class of persons, and endowing them with privileges and rights superior to and beyond what are enjoyed by persons of a similar character in any State to which they may go. This however, is a question which I am not prepared to argue fully at this moment, nor do I think it is one that is germane to this bill at all. If it is pressed, however I will procure the evidence, and show that these acts of South Carolina, of Louisana, and perhaps of Georgia, are no more stringent on this subject than are the provision of the constitution of some of the non-slaveholding States. Illinois certainly has a clause not only recognizing colored persons as incapable of becoming citizens, but denying them the right of a local residence. Sir, would it not be a novel principle to introduce in our political relations, to say that it is in the power of Massachusetts to confer on my slave the right to return and claim privileges in South Carolina, to which, under the laws of that State, he could never have been entitled even had he remained there, or even to claim those rights appertaining to free persons of color, which he had forfeited by his escape from the State? It is a monstrous proposition. A slave escapes from me in South Carolina and goes to Massachusetts, he obtains his freedom there by a refusal to surrender him up, and he is made a governor—I suppose he may be made a governor, or brigadier general, or something of that description in Massachusests?

Mr. DAVIS, of Massachusetts. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUTLER. So I supposed, sir. Well, General Snowball comes back to South Corolina, and he goes to his master, and tells him, "Sir, I am a citizen, and I demand to be put in the enjoyment of all the rights to which the white citizen is entitled. I demand the right to go into your society, to go into all your public assemblages, to go into your churches—in a word, I demand all the rights which appertain to any free citizen of South Carolina!" The idea is preposterous, not to say revolting. I know that this is thought in the abstract to be a very innocent kind of legislation, but in the concrete, gentlemen, I am sure, do not understand what they are legislating upon. But, sir, I repeat, I do not intend to go into this argument this evening, and if this amendment is insisted upon, I shall ask, as a matter of courtesy, that it be postponed until to-morrow, or Monday.

Mr. FOOTE. I suppose we are all familiar with the argument.

Mr. BUTLER. All are not so familiar with it as the Senator, nor am I as prompt, perhaps, in these matters as he. It is a grave question, and deserves full investigation and consideration.

Mr. FOOTE. I merely intended to say that I had heard the able argument of the Senator on this subject, on a former occasion, and supposed we were all familiar with it.

Mr. BUTLER. The question is of too serious import to be thus disposed of. I could procure, I suppose, the materials and references which I require, after some delay, but I hope the amendment will not be pressed this evening. I feel bound, however, inasmuch as it is a matter touching the courtesies of society in South Carolina, to say a word in reference to the treatment experienced by the gentleman sent from Massachusetts, to which allusion has been made. I think, sir, after the many refusals which had been intimated to Massachusetts on this subject that when she insisted on sending Mr. Hoar there, it was under the circumstances, a proceeding very well calculated to excite the popular feeling. He went there, however with his daughter, and on the occasion referred to, the gentleman of Charleston, with marked courtesy and delicacy, so far from permitting the crowd which the excitement had collected to go to the house where they were, absolutely prevented it. Mr. Hoar was understood to be a gentleman, a man of professional position in his own State, and my friend Mr. Rose, who was one of the committee appointed on the occasion, politely invited the daughter to his own house. He said also to Mr. Hoar, "We do not require you to leave Charleston. You are perfectly welcome, and we invite you to share fully in all the social relations of our society. All we ask of you is to give up this commission, and not attempt to interfere with this question here."—I will not deny that the gentleman was placed in an embarrassing position under the circumstances, as a man of honor, in view of the relations in which he stood towards his State; but in justice to the people of South Carolina, and particularly the people of Charleston, I wish to say that there was no mob on that occasion. The fact is, there was a strong popular feeling, but this is the mode in which they treated this gentleman—they merely asked him to give up his commission, and refrain from acting under it Mr. Hoar replied that he must retain his commission and discharge his duty to his State, so far as he could and it was then said to him, "If that be your situation, we intimate that you had better leave the city," and on that intimation he did leave. Not a hand was raised against him, and such was the delicacy with which he and his daughter were treated in this matter, that she might have continued to reside in and enjoy the society of Charleston, and hardly have known that anything of the kind had occurred. She never would have known it from her own observation. I know that this matter has been variously represented, but these are the facts, and I have no desire other than that they shall be placed before the community in their true light.

Now, sir, the appearance before a court in that city of a person of this description, claiming the enjoyment of all the rights pertaining to a white man, would be a most novel exhibition to say the least.—Many of us in South Carolina have freed these persons—I myself have done so, as the representative of an estate—and have sent them to the North. I know also of many free colored persons who have left Charleston and gone there, among them the Joneses, as respectable persons of that class as there are at the North. Many of them have petitioned the Legislature to allow them, under a special law, to return, but permission has been refused them. And yet, under the proposition presented here, Massachusetts has only to take these people and make citizens of them, and they may return to South Carolina in violation of that law. What can be said of such a proposition as that?

I have said, on anothee occasion, that the old acts of Congress are very particular in referring to the sailors engaged in the foreign commerce of the country, to designate them as citizens, and as native free persons of color, thus expressly making a distinction between citizens and free persons of color. These are the acts of Congress passed—I will not say in the better days of their history—but certainly when a more cordial understanding existed between Massachusetts and South Carolina. The act of 1790, in regard to seamen, for instance, if examined will be found to contain a clause saying expressly that citizens only, or native free persons of color, shall be sailors—thus distinguishing between them, and clearly showing that it was never contemplated that free persons of color should ever be regarded as citizens of the United States. I do not say that a person of this character, so long as he confines himself to the State that chooses to confer on him these privileges, may not enjoy the complete rights and immunities of a citizen there, but I do deny the proposition that it is in the power of any one State to confer upon them the right to enjoy those privileges in any State where the laws forbid it, or where a *status* of that description is unknown. But this is perhaps foreign to the question as presented here, which is to provide means to try this question before the courts.

Mr. DAVIS, of Massachusetts. That is the point.

Mr. BUTLER. I will not go into the matter, for I do not consider it germane to this bill. And if the amendment is adopted, I do not say that such is the desire of the mover, but the result will be to defeat this bill.

But I am not prepared at this moment to do justice to myself or to an argument as to the proper construction of an article of the Constitution of so grave a consequence as the one involved here. It requires more time and attention than it is in my power to bestow upon it, with my notice thus unexpectedly called to it, and I have made these hasty and fully presenting, the serious objections which exist to the adoption of the amendment. But, clearly, South Carolina should not be especially singled out in this manner; for Louisiana, and perhaps Georgia, have similar laws; and Illinois, and I do not know but others of the Northwestern States have clauses in their constitutions that repudiate the idea that a freeman of color in Massachusetts, although a citizen there, can be a citizen in another State. You are opening the discussion of a very delicate question of jurisdiction by this amendment, and it is one which, however it may lead to irritation elsewhere, I shall seek to discuss with perfect calmness and deliberation. I do not, however, think it belongs to this law, and if adopted, I am confident it is an amendment which will break it down.

Mr. BERRIEN.—I have been very anxious that we should be enabled to bring this bill to a close today, but if it is the purpose of the Senator from Massachusetts to persevere in attaining the provisions made in the amendment he has offered to this bill, and he does not consent to make it a distinct and substantive measure, it seems to me that we cannot, in justice to the subject, proceed to final action upon this bill to-day. Sir, it is one of the gravest questions that can be presented to the consideration of the American Congress. It is a question as to the power of the several States to pass those laws which are deemed by them essential to their safety, where those police laws may conflict with the general powers of the National Government. That is the true and real question which is presented here. Congress has the power to control commerce between the different States; the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges of citizens in the several States. Here are the grounds upon which the claim rests on the part of the United States. But the Supreme Court of the United States has decided that each State has the power to pass police regulations and laws for their internal government, and for their internal protection. They have recognized and affirmed the constitutionality of quarantine laws conflicting with the commercial provisions of the United States, and they have, by the legislation of the Congress of the United States, made it the duty of the revenue officers of the United States to give their aid and assistance to enforce these quarantine laws in each State.

Now, sir, if the Congress of the United States and the supreme judicial tribunal of the United States have recognized the power and authority of the Legislatures of the several States to pass laws for their protection against physical disease, will it be asserted that, under the influence of the same principle and duty of self-preservation, they have not the right to pass laws for their protection against that which is more, infinitely more dangerous to them than any physical contagion? I mean the influence which is exerted by the introduction of free persons of color, call them citizens or whatever name you may, into a community where the institution of Slavery exists, with the means of practicing upon the ignorance of these people, of deluding them into insurrection, and placing in jeopardy the lives of the people of those States. If the Legislature of South Carolina possesses the power to pass laws to prevent physical infection or contagion with the Government of the United States will require its own officers to aid and assist in enforcing, although those quarantine laws interfere with the general exercise of the commercial powers of the United States, will they interfere with the exercise of the same power, directed to a different and much more dangerous subject, that of preventing the emissaries of these abolition societies from coming, as from personal knowledge in my own State I say they have been found to come, into the Southern States for the purpose of exciting insurrection?

Sir, the [illegible] which are to be exercised by the General Government, and [illegible] which are to be exercised by the States in this complex system of government of ours, must necessarily frequently interfere; and the only true principle upon which the relative and the conflicting obligations of the laws which shall be made by these different sources can be arrested is, that whenever a law passed by the Government of the United States is indispensable to the exercise of granted powers, there it must have scope, and must control State legislation, but whenever, in various means, some may be selected which do not conflict with State legislation, and others that will, it is the incumbent duty of the General Government to select the former. The question here is—referring to Massachusetts and South Carolina, those particular States having been spoken of—whether Massachusetts shall have the privilege of employing on board her vessels trading to Charleston colored seamen, at the hazard of endangering the lives of the people of that city; or whether it is a greater inconvenience that Massachusetts should employ men whose entry into South Carolina is not forbidden by her laws, than that South Carolina, yielding to this claim of Massachusetts, shall be thrown open to the efforts of these colored men to incite insurrection among the colored population of that State.

I do not mean to enter into the full discussion of this subject, but I will say that, in my judgment, it is one of the gravest subjects which can be presented to the consideration of the American Congress It is peculiarly unfortunate to be presented now, in the present excited state of public feeling, and that it should be appended to a bill the object of which was to produce peace and harmony. There can be no question that you have the numerical power to put this clause in the bill, but if you do, it must destroy it. No Southern man may be permitted to vote for a bill which contains a provision by which the lives of their wives and children may be put in jeopardy, and by which they may be subjected to all the horrors of servile insurrection. I would appeal to the Senator if this question must be discussed, to present it in a separate form. Let it be a substantive measure; let us discuss it on its own merits, and not embarrass the present bill by provisions which are more calculated to excite Southern feeling than any action which can be had by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. WINTHROP. I very cheerfully acquiesce in the suggestion which has been made on all sides of the Senate, that this question should be taken to-day. But, inasmuch as several Senators have already spoken upon the subject, I feel bound by my relations to a State which has been particularly aggrieved by these Southern laws, not to remain entirely silent. And I am the more impelled to say a few words before the vote is taken, by what has just fallen from the Senator from Mississippi, (Mr. Davis.) He has taken occasion to remark that if the people of Massachusetts are excited upon this subject it is only because they do not understand the nature of it Now, sir, this is no new question. It is no new question to Massachusetts. It is no new question to the country and to Congress. I was not at all surprised to hear the Senator from Georgia argue the case with so much readiness and ability as he has done. I believe that distinguished Senator, as Attorney-General of the United States, gave an official opinion many years ago that the law of South Carolina was entirely constitutional.

Mr. BERRIEN. It was not this question.

Mr. WINTHROP. I understand that the law was the same, though the facts may have been different; and I understand that the official opinion of the Senator covered the whole question of the constitutionality of the law. Why, Mr. President, in the year 1842 or 1843, I happened to be upon a committee in the House of Representatives to whom this question was referred, and I made a report on the subject, taking the ground of the injustice and unconstitutionality of these Southern statutes. An honorable friend from North Carolina, who is no longer a member of the House, but whom I have had the pleasure of meeting here this very day (Mr. Rayner), submitted a minority report in opposition to mine. It was he who first brought to my notice the opinion of the honorable Senator from Georgia. He appended it at full length to his report. He cited it triumphantly in favor of his views Indeed, I may say that he rested his argument in favor of the constitutionality of these laws almost entirely upon that opinion. I can only say that he was mistaken; it was the mistake of one friendly to that side of the case, and of one who had given the most careful and diligent examination to the whole subject.

I alluded to this point, however, only for the purpose of saying that the question had not only been decided by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, but that it had received a precisely opposite decision from sources entitled to equal consideration and respect. It was brought up before the Circuit Court of the United States in the city of Charleston itself, and the honorable William Johnson, a native citizen of South Carolina, and one of the most eminent men who have adorned our Supreme bench, gave an elaborate opinion that this was an unconstitutional law. This was in the year 1823. More than that: Mr. John Quincy Adams having been called upon, when Secretary of State, by the British Government, with regard to the operation of this law upon a British subject, consulted Mr. William Wirt, then Attorney General of the United States, and he, too, though a citizen of the slaveholding State of Maryland, gave an opinion, in the fullest and most unqualified terms, that the law was against the constitution, treaties, and laws of the Union.

It seems, therefore, that the State of Massachusetts is not so entirely uninformed with regard to the ground of the argument as to these police regulations of the Southern States, and that she is not without good and sufficient cause for demanding that the final decision of this matter may be submitted to some other and less interested tribunals than the Legislatures of the States which choose to enact such statutes. Sir, it is no mere question of citizenship which is involved in this controversy. Even if it were, however, I am by no means sure that we might not cite the authority of more than one of the Southern States in favor of our position. My honorable friend from North Carolina (Mr. Badger) will bear witness, if I mistake not, that it is only within twelve or fifteen years that the constitution of his own State has been changed, under which free colored persons were entitled to vote side by side with their white brethren.

Mr. BADGER. The constitution of North Carolina, as originally framed, did not permit the elective franchise to citizens by that name It was given to all freemen, who had lived within the State a certain length of time, and who had paid taxes.

Mr. WINTHROP. At any rate, these free colored persons voted for their own rulers, and took part in that great business of self-government which is the distinctive feature in our republican system. Why, sir, unless I am greatly mistaken, it was the honorable Lewis Williams—one of the most excellent men who ever represented North Carolina, or any other State, in the House—who lived to be the father of the House, and died universally respected and lamented—it was he, I think, who told me, that when he first entered Congress he came by the votes of free colored persons. They gave the casting vote in his district, and gave it in his favor. So it was in Tennessee not many years since. The honorable Senator from that State, immediately behind me (Mr. Bell), has known the day when there were three or four hundred colored voters in his own district. The constitution of Tennessee has since been altered, and I believe it has deprived this class of persons of any participation in the elective franchise.

But I repeat, Mr. President, it is no mere question of citizenship which we desire to have settled. The question is, whether, upon the ground of police regulations, or upon any other ground, the States of South Carolina, Alabama, Louisiana, and Florida, shall have the right to take the stewards and mariners out of our vessels, and imprison them, and even sell them into Slavery for life, for no other crime than their color? It matters little to this issue whether they are citizens or not. They are persons "held to service or labor," if you please to call them so. They have entered into articles of agreement, with the master of the vessel on board of which they are shipped, to perform service and labor of a certain sort, during the voyage. Under these Southern laws, they are taken out of the vessel in which they are thus articled and employed, carried on shore, and incarcerated; and unless the master shall afterwards reclaim them, at a heavy expense, they are liable to be sold and held as absolute slaves. This is the language of the statute. And all that we now ask is, that the constitutionality of such a statute should be solemnly adjudicated by some competent and disinterested tribunal. Can any one say that such a demand is unreasonable?

With regard to the mission of Mr. Hoar, it ought to be remembered that, before he was sent to South Carolina, the Governor of Massachusetts had made application to more than one of the most distinguished lawyers of that State to bring this subject before the courts. He attempted to avail himself of the professional services of any member of the Charleston bar who might be willing to test the constitutionality of that law. It was only after these attempts had failed that this Massachusetts *emissary*, as he has been somewhat reproachfully called, was appointed to the service. I cannot but think that the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Butler) should remember this fact, in justification of Massachusetts, if indeed she needs any justification, for the appointment of Mr. Hoar.

Mr. President, the question which Massachusetts desires to have decided is simply whether we have the right to employ, as stewards and mariners, on board of our own vessels, such persons as we find it expedient or necessary to employ, and to enter freely with them at the Southern ports of this Union. Why, sir, in many of the Northern ports it is almost impossible to find any other than colored persons for these particular berths of cooks and stewards.—Southern Senators know well how peculiarly adapted they are for such services. Our shipmasters are often compelled to take one or two of them in these capacities. Well, sir, the vessels are bound to Liverpool, perhaps. They stop at Charleston or some other Southern port for a cargo of cotton. Instantly on arriving at the wharf they are boarded and searched, and these colored hands, while ever so innocently employed in cooking a meal or keeping a watch, are seized, carried on shore, and imprisoned; and all this for fear they may incite somebody to insurrection, or communicate what is called a moral contagion to the blacks on shore.

Sir, it is proverbial that these violent courses generally defeat their own ends. And I remember to have heard or read an anecdote illustrative of the effect which is sometimes the result of this most arbitrary and unjustifiable practice. One of these free colored persons is said to have been seized and carried on shore, and shut up—while the vesssel to which he belonged remained in port—in the very same cell in which a number of free blacks or of runaway slaves, perhaps, were confined. He had thus the very best of all opportunities for preaching the doctrines of abolition to his companions, and for effecting the very object, which, if he had been allowed to remain at his work, under the hatches of his own vessel, at the caboose or in the cabin, he could never have accomplished. I will only add, in conclusion, that such acts are, in my judgment, a wholly unnecessary exercise of power, and one entirely unjustified by any thing which can be found in the constitution of the United States.

Mr. BUTLER. It seems to me that if that degree of excitement of which the gentleman from Massachusetts has spoken really exists in that State, it is rather a curious circumstance to be observed that some step has not been taken to give effect to the wishes of the people of Massachusetts by the legislation of Congress at an earlier period, and not leave it to be taken up in connexion with this bill, and by this amendment destroy the bill itself. Now, I ask the Senator from Massachusetts, if he states upon his own knowledge the circumstances of the anecdote which he has recited?

Mr. WINTHROP. Certainly not, sir. I distinctly stated that I had heard them, somewhere or other, when my attention was officially called to the question some eight or nine years ago.

Mr. BERRIEN. I am rather inclined to think the anecdote was composed for the purpose of having it used as it has been, though certainly not by the honorable Senator from Massachusetts. Sir, the opinion given by myself when Attorney-General of the United States was cited, as the Senator says, as it has been cited by myself; but neither citation proves that the reference to that opinion is correctly made. The question in that case regarded a man who was not a citizen of the United States. It was on an appeal made by the British Government to this Government, under circumstances of suspicion between that Government and our own, for the protection of a British mariner in the port of Charleston. It is true that Mr. Justice Johnson did give his opinion against the law, and it is true that Mr. Attorney-General Wirt gave his opinion against it. But, upon examination of that case and the law enacted at the time, it was found that the Congress of the United States imposed penalties upon persons of that description being brought into the States having those laws; and this law of Congress had been overlooked, as well as the opinion of Attorney-General Wirt.

But, if we can have the vote, I will abandon my proposition to postpone the further consideration of the question. I am content that the vote shall be taken.

Mr. WINTHROP. I desire only to be understood correctly as to a matter of fact. I still understand that the opinion of the Senator from Georgia was given with reference to the precise law of South Carolina now under consideration. The case was different, but the law was the same.

Mr. BERRIEN. It was a decision given with reference to a British subject, founded upon a law of the Congress of the United States, and therefore it does not embrace this case.

Mr. WINTHROP. Will the Senator be good enough to say whether his opinion was given with reference to the law of which Massachusetts complains, or another law?

Mr. ATCHISON. Will the Senator from Georgia permit me to make a motion to adjourn?

SENATORS. No, no, no!

Mr. BERRIEN. There were three question considered in that opinion.

"1. The power of the Legislature of South Carolina to pass this law."

"2. How far it may constitutionally operate, notwithstanding its liability incidentally to conflict with the general commercial laws of the United States and the particular conventions with Great Britain."

"3. Whether this law does, in point of fact, conflict with the laws of the United States and the particular conventions with Great Britain."

The law referred to by me was one which I cited as expressly forbidding "the act of bringing of Daniel Frazer, a person of color, into the port of Charleston."

"'By an act entitled 'An act to prevent the importation of certain persons into certain States where, by the laws thereof, their admission is prohibited,' masters or captains of ships or vessels are forbidden, under a severe penalty, 'to import or bring, or cause to be imported or brought, any negro, mulatto, or person of color, not being a native or citizen, or registered citizen of the United States or seamen natives of countries beyond the Cape of Good Hope, into any port or place of the United States, which port or place shall be situated in any State which, by law, has prohibited or shall prohibit the importation of such negro, mulatto, or other person of color.'

"The terms used in the act, to *import* or *bring*, and *importation* or *admission*, are intended to apply, with the exceptions specified, of '*natives, citizens*, or *registered seamen of the United States*,' and 'seamen *natives of countries beyond the Cape of Good Hope*,' to all other persons of color, free or slave; and that the framers of the act were aware that such would be its operation is manifest, from the fact that a proviso is added expressly for the purpose of preventing the act from being construed to prohibit the admission of Indians.'"

What I have to say on this subject is, that the question which was presented to me, and which governed me, was a question which did not necessarily involve the subject now before the Senate. It applied to the case of a British subject.

Mr. WINTHROP. All that I asserted was, that the decision was given with reference to the same law. That, I believe, was the fact.

Mr. ATCHISON. I move to postpone this matter until Monday, and I give notice that I shall not withdraw the motion.

Mr. FOOTE. Very well. We can vote it down.

The question being taken on postponing the further consideration of the bill, it was not agreed to.

Mr. BALDWIN. I wish to say a few words, and do not intend to occupy much of the time of the Senate, but this is a question in which not only Massachusetts, but other States concerned in navigation feel an interest. I regard the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts as a proper amendment to be attached to this particular bill. The law of the State of South Carolina authorizes the arrest or seizure of any free negroes or colored persons coming into any of the ports of that State, as cooks, stewards, or mariners, and their confinement in prison until the vessel is ready to depart, when it requires the captain to carry them away and pay the expenses of their detention; and in case of his neglect or refusal to do so, it enacts "that such FREE negroes or persons of color shall be DEEMED and taken to be ABSOLUTE SLAVES, and SOLD."

By the laws of the State of South Carolina, then, a free man of a Northern State, guilty of no crime except his color, becomes an absolute slave to the person who purchases him. Under this law he is sold as a slave—not because his presence in South Carolina has endangered the peace and security of the people of that State, but because his captain has neglected to carry him away when the vessel departed, and because the negro is himself unable to obtain his discharge from imprisonment or to pay the expenses of his detention. Now, sir, this bill provides for the return of any fugitives who owe service, by the laws of the State from which they fled. By the laws of the State of South Carolina these men would be holden as slaves, and by the provisions of this bill upon that fact being ascertained by the commissioner in any free State, to which any such fugitive may have escaped he shall be delivered up to the claimant, to be remanded to the State from which he fled, there to have his title to freedom or the right of the purchaser to hold him in Slavery decided by the laws of South Carolina, under whose authority he was sold. Now, this amendment is intended to provide a mode of testing the validity of that law, under which a free citizen is liable to be sold as a slave, by authorizing an application to be made by the district attorney to the court of the United States for the discharge of seamen thus imprisoned, if in the opinion of the court, the law by which they are detained is unconstitutional and void. This is not a mere imaginary danger. The fact of such sale has actually occurred.

Mr. BUTLER. What and one been sold?

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes, sir, a free colored seaman sailing from the State of Connecticut. He arrived at a port in South Carolina, and while there he was seized and imprisoned, and sold as a slave. He was taken as a slave to New Orleans, and held there under the sale made in pursuance of this law of South Carolina. I was applied to, more than twenty years ago by a gentleman in New Orleans, who has since occupied a distinguished position under this Government, for the purpose of taking testimony at New Haven to support his claim to freedom, he having made several voyages from that port. I said I was applied to; a commission was sent to another gentleman now resident in Philadelphia, and my name was inserted with his in the commission.

Mr. BUTLER. Was he discharged?

Mr. BALDWIN. I believe he was discharged; but he was sold under the law of South Carolina. If the question had been made under that law, and in the State of South Carolina, whether that seaman was legally held in Slavery pursuant to that sale, the judges of that State would in all probability have decided in accordance with the provisions of that law. If he had escaped from the person who bought him in South Carolina and come to a free State, he must, under the provisions of this bill, have been remanded to South Carolina, in order to have the question as to his title to freedom, or the right of the purchaser to hold him in Slavery, determined by the law of that State. Who can doubt that, under that law, a South Carolina judge would have felt himself bound to regard him as a slave?

Mr. BUTLER. I do not intend to answer what has been said in regard to this case. I think it is nothing new, and I think when it comes to be examined it will be found to be a very different one from what it is represented.

Mr. DICKINSON. I have been waiting for the debate on the bill to close and an opportunity to make a single remark, without detaining the Senate. I was called from the Senate a few moments this morning, and understand that whilst absent the Senator from Florida read to the Senate the proceedings of a hybrid gathering, called a public meeting held in Cazenovia, in the State of New York and commented thereon. Not having heard his remarks, I cannot reply to them, nor perhaps is it necessary. But if the Senator could understand and would heed with what unutterable scorn and contempt the great mass of the people of that State view such proceedings as those described, he would not augur any great evil from them, nor seek to give them character by notice.

I take this occasion to say that I disclaim, for the State which I have the honor to represent in part, for its jurisdiction, its government, and its people, in every conceivable form, any sympathy with such atrocious proceedings, and to declare that the people of all parties in that State, except its half demented and its madmen, look upon such exhibitions of folly and wickedness with loathing and disgust. So far from having sympathy with such conduct, every day shows that public opinion is becoming more and more sound and the tone of feeling thus indicates that abolitionism has held its saturnalia. Its dark tide is now rapidly ebbing. These abuses, if they ever get character enough to entitle them to so grave a notice, may require legislation, and if so, I have no doubt it will be had, and justice done in the premises. This is all I have to say.

The question was then taken on the amendment of the Seabtor from Massachusetts, (Mr. Davis,) and it was lost—13 to 27.

L. M. SARGENT—THE STANDARD CORRESPONDENT—AND OURSELVES.

[*From the Dedham (Mass.) Gazette.*]

Two or three weeks ago, we republished a portion of a letter of the Boston Correspondent of the New York *Anti-Slavery Standard*, (understood to be Mr. Edmund Quincy, of this town,) in which he gave some account of the "Sigma" of the *Transcript*. This letter has elicited the following ebullition from that "eminent hand." From the violent fluttering of the fowl, we cannot but think Mr. Quincy's shot was well aimed and has taken excellent effect. We think our readers will excuse the length of this extract, in consideration of its exceeding richness. If Mr. Quincy takes any notice of this effusion, our readers may depend upon having the benefit of it.

* * * * * *

My dear Mr. Transcript, I handed you a few days ago, for perusal, a letter of three pages, from a highly respected friend, the Mayor of one of our neighboring

DEFECTIVE ORIGINAL COPY

cities. I had received it that day. After thanking me for the "printed sheet" I had sent him, and for my efforts, in opposition to these "disorganizers and maniacs," he proceeded, very ably and earnestly, to exhibit his detestation and abhorrence, for this whole brotherhood of pestilent fellows This letter seemed incomprehensible to me. I had sent my friend no printed sheet. Shortly after, through the attention, doubtless, of the "Christlike" Garrison, I received a "printed sheet," myself. The mystery was explained The printed sheet contains three columns, composed of garbled extracts from the *Transcript* articles, on Blasphemy; and, at the end, two columns, purporting to be a letter, dated Boston, July the 15, 1850, to the Editor of the *National Anti-Slavery Standard*, over the signature of D Y. This letter was so very full of falsehood and abuse, in regard to myself, that I never supposed it to be the production of any person, claiming to be a gentleman. Now, my excellent friend, who wrote me the letter, which I gave you, did so, without having glanced at the two last columns, which constituted the main object of Garrison, in circulating the "*printed sheet.*" On the very day, after the "*printed sheet*" was sent to me, two gentlemen, on the Exchange, thanked me for the "*printed sheet*" I had sent them remarking, that they had read the articles before in the *Transcript*. I was quite amused, while at the Post Office, to perceive, that almost everybody here off a "*printed sheet.*" My friends, relatives, and connections were duly served with the "*printed sheet,*" at their dwellings. The "Christlike" Garrison, who, long ago, published his "*final rejoinder,*" has circulated this "*printed sheet,*" at no little expense of time money, and toil.

But we are soon to have an Anti Slavery Fair; and funds will be raised to pay for this effort *in favor of abolition;* and for *The Liberator;* and to feed Garrison; that, under color of Anti-Slavery, he may continue to preach Treason, Blasphemy, and Falsehood Am I rightly informed, that not a farthing of all collected at these famous fairs, goes directly to purchase the freedom of a single slave? Surely it behooves all those, who dispense their money, shrewdly, to enquire in regard to its appropriation.

Not long after I received the "*printed sheet,*" I was favored by the attentive Garrison with a copy of *The Liberator*; which, after causing it to be fumigated, I proceeded to glance over, carefully placing myself near an open window, and to windward of this highly aromatic journal. The first thing, that met my eye, was the "*printed sheet*;" and afterwards, a statement from the *Dedham Gazette* importing that the scurrilous letter of July 15th, '50, was the work of Mr. Edmund Quincy. Sir, I will not believe it; and I am shocked that the *Dedham Gazette* should ascribe to this inoffensive person, a letter so full of absolute falsehood, and so singularly barren of common sense. My very sincere respect, for the father of this unfortunate individual, will compel me to disbelieve this story as long as possible. The writer of the letter has gone back, for nearly half a century, and brought forward my personal concerns—my private affairs—for what? To prove that Garrison is not guilty of blasphemy! How different from my own course! The only allusion, that I have made to Mr. Garrison's private relations, has been, in the statement, that he had the reputation, in private life, of being an amiable man

It is an axiom, among men of just and honorable feelings, that he who parades the private, personal concerns of another, which have not the slightest relation to the question in issue; and, to disprove a charge of blasphemy, seeks arguments among the follies and indiscretions of an old man's youth, is a consummate puppy—a miserable blackguard. Now the writer of the letter has done this. How then dare the Editor of the *Dedham Gazette* to cast this dishonorable and degrading imputation, upon Mr. Edmund Quincy!

Besides, sir, my relations to this individual have been such as not at all to authorize the expectation of a scurrilous assault from him. His conduct to me has ever been extremely civil and respectful. On my part, though ever ready to sympathize with those, who have mourned and deplored over his preposterous and fantastical career, and perfectly aware of his intimate fellowship with those bad citizens: I have scrupulously abstained from the slightest allusion to Mr Edmund Quincy, during the present discussion, from an extreme reluctance to give pain, in a quarter, where I desired to give pleasure only. When, a year or two since, the editor of the *Daily Advertiser* reported, in two columns, side by side, simultaneous addresses of Miss Abby Folsom, and Mr. Edmund Quincy, both addressing the chair, at the same moment; I was very truly sorry for it; and, the more so, because, though I inwardly resolved not to laugh at the predicament of this unfortunate individual, I was completely carried away, by the mischievous humor of the presentment.

Now, Mr. Editor, Mr. Edmund Quincy is not the writer of the letter: *Credat Judæus Apella—non ego.* I will not believe it, until he swears to it, before a Justice of the Peace; and this I apprehend he will not do, having resigned his own commission, if I understand it aright, on the ground that no man had a right to be a justice, or to make one. So you see I never shall believe this vile slander

An aged, clerical friend once urged me to write a tract against the use of tobacco—"*not a grave one,*" said he, "*that will do no good: but make the practice as ridiculous, as you can,*" I wrote the "Diary of the Rev. Solomon Spittle." My old friend told me it had wrought wonders, among the clergy, near him. *Mr Edmund Quincy, I was told, commended it, very highly in print.* The fellow, who writes the dirty letter, slights and abuses it—a clear proof, that Mr. Edmund is not the writer. This pestilent fellow says:—

"It was in this book, by the way, that this Censor, who condemns Mr. Garrison and the Abolitionists for their scurrility towards opposers, and especially towards *the Clergy*, lampooned Bishop Eastburn, the Head of his own Church, (for he is or was a zealous Churchman,) whose personal character and official position (even if he did smoke) entitled him to the treatment of a gentleman, as 'BISHOP BEASTLY!!!'"

Now, Mr. Editor, does any one believe that Mr. Edmund would so boldly tell such a confounded lie as this? Certainly not. To be grave, Mr. Transcript, a more groundless and impudent falsehood was never uttered by man, woman, or Garrison. There are, doubtless, bishops, priests, and deacons, who smoke, chew and guzzle. I am very sorry for it. But the assertion, that *Bishop Eastburn* was designed, by the title of *Bishop Beastly*, is utterly false; and not more false than foolish. The truth will do no harm; and I frankly admit, that without any very particular design, when that title was employed, I had the very faulty diocesan of another State, in my thoughts.

This lying letter writer says of me:—

"One day, two or three years ago, he fell upon a handcartman, in our streets, assisted by his son, an uncommonly robust young man, and thrashed him to his heart's content, because the churl objected to their dog's treating some goods in his keeping as Launce's dog did the gentlewoman's Farthingale."

Here, my dear Mr. Editor, is another deliberate lie; and how the Editor of the *Dedham Gazette* can reconcile it, even to his accommodating conscience, to ascribe the falsehoods of this reckless scribbler, D. Y., to Mr. Edmund Quincy, I cannot conceive. The incident, referred to, was one, which might easily happen to almost any citizen; it is really not worth relating; and yet I must briefly relate it, or suffer a lie, now so industriously circulated by Garrison, to pass for truth. I was passing up Court street, with my son, followed by a favorite dog of his—it is troublesome to be followed by a puppy at any time—I find it so, at present. Hearing the puppy yelp, I turned round, and saw a man hurling pieces of wood at the dog. I bade him desist. He answered very roughly. I laid my hand upon his arm without any violence, and again bade him desist. He replied with increasing insolence; and my son shook him, for an instant, by the shoulder. *Not a blow was struck.* A man, with a long red goatee, interfered; and as he stood with his head raised, and the goatee pointed towards me—"*the handle towards my hand*"—it seemed to me "*the very instrument I was to use.*" Accordingly, to the edification and amusement of all present, I took him by the goatee—*leniter manus imponens;* and, turning him in another direction, requested him, "*most respectfully*" as Mr. Mann has it, to go home. As I have said, *not a blow was struck.* Now, other authority, and better than the *Dedham Gazette*, will be required, to convince me, that Mr. Edmund Quincy has written and caused to be published, in New York, over the signature of D. Y., in relation to my son and myself, a lie, so direct and so absolute.

Here, of course, were technical assaults and batteries. The owner of the handcart and of the goatee resorted, as usual, to the police court; and Justice Merrill, with great good humor, imposed the small customary fine. He of the handcart applied to Mr. J. C. Park, to commence a civil action. The case was a clear one; and a few dollars were cheerfully given to avoid a ridiculous contest, in which the plaintiff must necessarily obtain a verdict, and possibly for more, than the trifle we were willing to give.

The goatee man employed a fellow, named Tasker, who commenced a suit, laying his damages at $2000, when Lawson and Harrington would not have given more than two cents for the whole goatee, as curled hair. Of this I took no notice. Not long before the term began, Tasker came to my office, and asked me if I should not like to settle the action. I told him, that I intended to submit the value of the goatee to a jury, and the question of his mal-practice to the court; as, from all I have heard, it was about time for him to be thrown over the bar. I never heard anything more of the suit, about the goatee.

Now instead of being the manifest and the malicious falsehood—the sheer lie—that it is, suppose the statement, that, "*with the assistance of my son, a very robust young man,*" *I had* "*thrashed the hand-cartman to his heart's content,*" to be true—What then? How far would that go, to relieve Garrison from the charge of being a paid preacher of blasphemy and treason?—Everybody knows what a logical creature Mr. Edmund is. No one therefore will believe him guilty of such a *non sequitur* as this. Hence we have additional proof, that a very great wrong has been done to him, by the Editor of the Dedham Gazette, in wickedly charging him with the authorship of this miserable tissue of weak and malicious falsehoods.

The writer of the letter says, that I once published a volume of poems, which, though upon a serious subject, made him merry. This is the common effect of serious things upon lightheaded people. Another striking proof that Mr. Edmund is not the author of the lying letter. The volume was published first in 1812, and the third and last edition, by Wells & Lilly, in 1815, when Mr. Edmund was scarcely out of his diapers.—Another proof. The writer of the letter does not think much of my *rhymes.* Nor do I. But what have my *rhymes* spun nearly forty years ago, to do with my *reasons*, in favor of frowning down a gang of traitors and blasphemers, at the present day? The volume was lauded altogether beyond its deserts, and very deservedly criticised, I dare say.

The writer of the letter says that my Dealings with the Dead are tedious. What a fastidious fellow he is! I exceedingly fear he will not be a whit better satisfied, with *my dealings with the living.* Here is another proof, that Mr. Edmund Quincy is not the author of the lying letter, for nobody, who considers the character and condition of his associates and coordinates, will ever charge him with unreasonable fastidiousness.

He next falls upon the Temperance Tales, and says that they were good for little, and have been long forgotten. Well, it is not for me to say a word to the contrary of this. I only ask, what in the name of common sense, has all this to do with Garrison's blasphemy?

These Temperance Tales are said to have done a little good in their day, and I thank God, for nothing, more gratefully, than for permitting me to be the humble minister of that good, through their publication. I have a curious record of the conversions these humble and simple narriatives have wrought, here, and in other lands: and I am half inclined to suspect the story about their being utterly *forgotten* may, after all, be another of this scribbler's lies. Thank Heaven, they contain no sentiment, adverse to the laws of God or the constitution of my country—that there is nothing there to lessen any man's respect for the Sabbath, or to diminish his reverence, for '*the most fashionable book*'—to inculcate seditious principles, or break up the foundations of society—to insult the teachers of piety and religion; or to stimulate my countrymen—with the banner or *non resistance* expanded to the breeze—to *resist*, to the utmost, the laws and the constitution of their country.

I have endeavored, Mr. Editor, as you perceive, to defend Mr. Edmund Quincy from the scandalous charge, made by the Editor of the Dedham Gazette, of being the author of the tissue of absurdities and lies, transmitted from Boston to New York, in the letter, over the signature of D. Y. If that editor had said, that Mr. Edmund Quincy had filled the hearts of his nearest friend, with a deep sense of grief and shame, by his ridiculous and vicious conduct, as one of these disorganizers; or that his near friends had almost persuaded themselves to seek a melancholy solace, in the idea, painful as it is, that he was actually crazy; or if this editor had asserted, that Mr. Edmund Quincy had put the finishing hand to nature's work, and made an ass and a fool of himself—I should not have stepped forth, in his defence. All this I have heard so often, and from persons, for whose good judgment I entertain so much respect, that I should have avoided an unprofitable controversy, and submitted to public sentiment. But, sir, when the Editor of the Dedham Gazette, so far forgets himself, as to proclaim aloud, that Mr. Edmund Quincy is the author of so much impertinence and absurdity, and of so many wicked and malicious lies—all I can say, is, that he ought to be talked to.

The question painfully returns—who is the author of the scurrilous letter? Sure enough, who is it?

May I hazard a conjecture? It is a *variorum classic.* The rough draft was prepared by some practised hand, in the mad house, at Worcester. The signature D. Y.—how ingenious!—the initial and terminant letters of *devilry*—was contrived by Mr. Edmund himself. He also loaned the use of his happy style, known, among rhetoricians, as *the hysterical*, for the occasion. The raw material, the lies, were probably supplied by Garrison, from his ample store. Mr. Henry C. Wright may have furnished the logic. The punctuation, by Mr. Theodore Parker. The interjections by the Rev. Mr. May, assisted by the Rev. Mr. Spear.

This is mere conjecture. There is one individual—the only participant in these meetings, for whom I entertain a sentiment of respect, and who, I trust and believe, has had neither part nor lot, in this dirty work; and whose superior style of composition, and high moral sense forbid the idea. I refer to Miss Abby Folsom.

What a propensity these disorganizers have, especially Garrison, for lying in dirty sheets! There let them lie. SIGMA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BOSTON POST.

Monday September 9th, 1850.

SIR: There appeared in the *Evening Transcript* of last Wednesday, (September 4,) an article under the signature of "Sigma," grossly vituperative of me, charging me, in particular, with *lying* in all the inflections of which the verb "*to lie*" is capable.—The next day I wrote a letter to the editor, commenting upon this attack upon my character, and showing how groundless it was. This letter was placed in his hands on the following morning. I have just had my letter returned to me, with one from the editor REFUSING TO INSERT IT!!!

—The injustice of this proceeding is so "open, gross and palpable" that it calls for no comment.—Every man of just and gentlemanlike feelings must regard it with contempt. May I ask of you, sir, as a lover of fair play, to give it an insertion in the *Post.* Very respectfully yours,

EDMUND QUINCY.

DEDHAM, September 5th, 1850.

To the Editor of the Transcript:

SIR—Your paper of last evening contained an article under the signature of "Sigma," upon, which as it was mainly devoted to me, I must ask your permission to make some remarks.

And, first, as to my personal identity. Sigma is unwilling to believe that I could be the author of the letter to the *Anti-Slavery Standard* which has grieved his righteous soul. He even refuses to credit it unless I make oath to the same before a competent magistrate. Now, painful as it is to forfeit the good opinion of one whose good opinion is so well worth having, I must own the soft impeachment which attributes the letter to me. If Sigma insists upon my purgation by the ordeal of swearing, I hereby offer to appear before any commissioner or justice of the peace he may select and make affidavit to the fact. He mistakes my scruple as to oath-taking. I have none against taking an oath which I mean to keep—as to tell the truth or to perform a trust. My objection is to an oath which I cannot conscientiously observe. This was the reason of my resignation of my commission of the peace, to which he alludes. When I came to consider that I held it under an oath to do certain things enjoined in the Constitution (the rendition of fugitive slaves, for one,) which I was deliberately resolved never to do, it appeared to me that, as a man of honor and integrity, I had nothing for it but to resign an office which I could hold only by virtue of an oath that I felt bound to break on the first opportunity. The lapse of some dozen years has only strengthened this opinion. That act may have been "preposterous and fantastical;" but it still appears to me one of very simple morality.

Sigma further thinks that I could not have written that letter because my past conduct to him had been "extremely civil and respectful." Of course I treated him like a gentleman, as long as he conducted himself like one. I used to regard him as a well-meaning though somewhat absurd and inflated person, and rejoiced in the measure of help he gave to the temperance cause. But when he undertook to attack Mr Garrison, a man whose friendship is one of the chief pleasures and honors of my life, with a coarse scurrility and vituperative insolence to which even the licentiousness of the American press scarcely affords a parallel; when he heaped his unmanly insults upon my revered friend, Mrs Lucretia Mott, a woman whom the late Doctor Channing characterized as "that beautiful example of womanhood"—a woman honored and loved by persons on both sides of the Atlantic, not merely superior to Sigma in mental and moral qualities and in social rank, but superior even to his own opinion of himself in these particulars; when he poured his ruffianly abuse upon her for maintaining the well known doctrines of the religious society of which she is a member and a minister, in terms which would have caused an indignant interposition on the part of any gentleman, had it been a street walker to whom they were applied; when he bespattered many other of my esteemed friends

"With the bile whose black'ning river
Rushes through his Stygian liver,"

and only spared myself, characteristically enough, as he himself admits, on account of the social position I happen to possess; in view of all these circumstances I felt that it was a case for chastisement. It was no pleasant task. I was perfectly well aware of the violent and unscrupulous character of the adversary I was about to provoke. I undertook it, however, and have no reason to be dissatisfied with the manner in which I performed it or with the effect it has had.

Well, sir, what was the chastisement I proposed to administer? Why, simply, a statement of his claims to be a Judge over Israel. He in gross language accuses me of "parading his private, personal concerns." That the concerns of his upon which I have commented are "personal" to him, I admit. That they are "private," I deny. Had I been willing to commit the impropriety with which he grossly charges me, I can assure you that I could have made that letter much more amusing, if not more edifying. No, sir, I did but pelt him with bouquets, as if he had been Jenny Lind herself; when, if I were not (as they say at the west) "in town with a pocket-full of rocks," it was not because I had not plenty offered me on all hands. His published works and his punishment by an open court of justice were all that I had animadverted upon. Are not these public property? May I not express my opinion upon them without being guilty of intruding on private life? I think I did justice to his works both in poetry, prose and war. I will not deny that I tried to put some of them and him in a ludicrous point of view—and, if I am not shamefully flattered, with some little success.—But what though? Is Sigma too great a man to be laughed at in the papers?

"Upon what meat doth this our Cæsar feed
That he is grown so great?"

Why, sir, you may hardly credit it, but it is a solemn fact, that those impudent newspapers have even had the assurance to laugh at *me!* And, to do the dogs justice, some of them did it uncommonly well. I have a collection of some of the best, which I entitle "GEMS OF MY CELESTIAL CROWN."

But Sigma wishes to know what these things have to do with his strictures on Mr. Garrison and his friends. Just this: They show what pretensions of mind, character and life he has to sit in judgment upon and condemn, in the spirit of St. Dominic and the language of Judge Jeffreys, men at least as good as himself. He takes their heresy for granted and fulminates his anathemas *ex cathedra.* That letter was meant to unfrock him, to show that he is a mock inquisitor, an abbot of unreason, having no authority to bind or to loose. His articles have no argument in them. Their whole weight depends on the weight of the writer's character. That letter was an attempt to discover, by approximation at least, how much it weighed.

The only mare's nest contradiction Sigma's reply contains of anything in the *Standard* letter is the denial that he meant Bishop Eastburn by "BISHOP BEASTLY," in "the Rev. Solomon Spittle," I shall not, certainly, impugn this denial, though I think it will take most of those that remember the book by surprise. The reasons, as I remember them, for supposing Bishop Eastburn to be meant were these. 1. Because he was the nearest bishop. 2. On account of the resemblance between the real and the fictitious name—certainly an unfortunate one if he was not meant. 3. Because it was currently reported at the time, that Bishop Eastburn had made use of the expression attributed to Bishop Beastly, viz: "that every gentleman smoked." But since the offensive intention is disclaimed, as far as he is concerned, I do most heartily accept Bishop Eastburn's declaration of that eminent prelate's [illegible] such company. But I do not see that Sigma has improved his position at all. Though he did not mean Bishop Eastburn, he "had in his thoughts" the "very faulty diocesan of another state." The argument is this. A man who will denounce a real or imaginary Rt. Rev. Father as uttering "an absolute, palpable and impudent falsehood" for the harmless colloquial exaggeration that "every gentleman smokes"—meaning (which is unfortunately true) *almost* every one—is not entitled to condemn the abolitionists for denouncing clergymen who buy and sell human beings, not excepting their own church members, and preach that such is the revealed will of God.

As to his contradiction of my version of the assault, I do not see that its material truth is touched by it. It only appears that Sigma committed *two* assaults instead of one. Whether it was "a thrashing" or not is a matter of verbal criticism. There may be a little thrashing as well as a great one. All that I can take back, as at present advised, is the statement that he thrashed the hand-cartman "*to his heart's content.*" I cannot but say, however, that I think Sigma does injustice to his fellow-citizens when he says his adventure was one "that might easily happen to almost any citizen." Otherwise it would not stand so decidedly alone as it does. As he is fond of classical allusions, I would remind him of what Æsop tells of the fox that had lost his tail.

As to the little wings on which my letter "went flying all abroad," I would inform Sigma that they were not paid for by Mr. Garrison. They were furnished by private contribution (not confined to abolitionists); and I am happy to say the adventurers declare they never made so remunerative an investment. Further, that the Anti-Slavery fair is not held for the benefit of Mr. Garrison or the Liberator, and that the proceeds go to the dissemination of no opinions excepting such as are strictly *Anti-Slavery.*

I shall forbear, sir, to characterize as it deserves the style of your contributor towards myself. I doubt whether its parallel can be found in any newspaper or book since the invention of printing. I am quite sure that no one human being ever told another that *he lied* so many times and in so many moods and tenses in the same number of words; certainly, none above the degree of a bargeman or fishwoman. Whether I have intentionally, or materially, exceeded the truth, on Sigma's own showing, I leave to those who have read my letters and his. If it suit his ideas of propriety to call a gentleman who had used all the decencies of language towards him, A PUPPY, A BLACKGUARD, A LIAR, AN ASS AND A FOOL, so be it. Whether either or all of these epithets rightly describe me, I shall also leave, without argument, to the judgment of an impartial public. I would say, however, that it ill becomes one who witnesses about the violation of his private life, because I commented on his published works and public punishment, to indorse rumors concerning my relations with my family, which a word of inquiry would have told him were false and slanderous. Your contributor, sir, is not fitted for the business he is in. His skin is too thin for a newspaper writer. Marsyas, after he was flayed, was a pachydermatous animal compared with him. If he cannot stand the test of ridicule, he had better turn his hand to something else. Especially he should remember that, of all men, he that lives in a glass house should be most careful how he throws stones at his neighbors' windows I will leave him here, for the present, commending to his consideration honest Stephano's advice to Trinculo—"Ever whilst thou livest, keep a good tongue in thy head!"

There is another thing relating to Sigma, but not connected with this matter, which I had intended to have said here But I have already devoured the lion's share of your columns. Perhaps, with your kind indulgence, I will make it the subject of a brief communication, at a future day.

I have the honor to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
EDMUND QUINCY.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

Without Concealment....Without Compromise.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1850.

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY

THE Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the Pennsylvania Anti Slavery Society, will be held in the Horticultural Hall at Westchester, commencing on Tuesday the 15th of October, at 10 o'clock, A. M., and continuing in session, probably, three days.

Never has there been a time in the history of this Society, when its members have been called upon more imperatively than at the present, for earnest counsel and zealous action. The propagandists of Slavery are making the most desperate efforts to extend their system into new regions, and to secure for it additional safeguards in those where it already exists. States formed out of our recently acquired territories, have been refused admission into the Union, solely because they have declined to engraft upon their constitutions the infamous slave system, and the only condition on which a proposition to receive them has been entertained, has been that certain concessions should first be made to the slave power by way of equivalent. It has been demanded that millions should be paid out of the national treasury to satisfy claims having no just existence; that the new territories should submit to a curtailment of their boundaries for the benefit of Slavery, and that a law should be passed for the recapture of fugitives, guaranteeing the master effectually against any loss, from the flight of his human property.

Monstrous as have been these demands, there have been representatives and people from the North craven and base enough to meet them with a ready compliance. A bill of the last mentioned character, the effect of which, if carried out as a law, would be to make every Northern citizen a kidnapper, has already passed the Senate and *received the votes of the members of that body from this State.* The Proviso of Freedom has been abandoned, and, under the intimidation of our Southern masters, ten millions of dollars and many thousands of square miles of free territory have been set apart for the especial use of the slaveholder.

When deeds like these are perpetrated, and when it is remembered in addition, that the slave system still exists within its former boundaries, in all its ancient atrocity, it is right that the friends of Freedom should meet together for counsel and deliberation. On the Abolitionists of Pennsylvania devolve especial obligations at this juncture, and we call upon them to assemble together with earnest hearts and ready hands to enquire what these obligations are. We trust there will be a full attendance of the members and friends of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society, at the time and place appointed.

We also invite our co-laborers in other States, and all sincere friends of the cause everywhere, to meet with us and participate in our deliberations

On behalf of the Executive Committee,
JAMES MOTT, Chairman.
H. WETHERALD, Secretary.

☞ Papers friendly to the object of the meeting are requested to copy this notice.

THE NEW EPOCH.

IT is not only true that "every moment is the meeting of two Eternities," but also that every such point of meeting is a Crisis in the destiny of individuals and nations. But there are times when, as in popular belief the tenth wave of the Ocean swells highest upon the beach, urged by the hurrying weight of the impatient waves behind, the force of impending events rolls thundering in one of those surging billows of destiny which leaves its mark far up the strand, and perhaps changes forever the boundaries of empires. It cannot be denied that one of those swelling surges, pregnant with fate, may be discerned blackening our far horizon and sweeping on, in sublime silence, towards the coast on which it is to dash and write its imperishable record. The approach of one of those Epochs from which History dates has been long looked for by those that watch the signs of the times, and expected by the tyrants with dread, and by the oppressed with joy. The heralds that proclaim the advent of imperial Change are uttering their message in the ears of mankind. Happy are they that fear not his coming!

It seems as if as soon as one Epoch has taken its place upon its throne, the rudiments of another begin to develope themselves, and gradually grow up to form its successor. The introduction of Christianity was followed by the Reformation; that Epoch was speedily succeeded by the Puritan Reformation of the Reformation, including, in its march, the New England Emigration, the English Commonwealth and the final establishment of Constitutional liberty by the Act of Settlement of the House of Orange From that period, the elements were at work which produced, first, our own Revolution, and then that of France. Ever since the Epoch from which we date, in this country, events, opinions and passions have been busy in preparing the way for the one that is to take its place. Mighty are the interests, fierce the passions, and heavy the sluggishness, that interpose themselves between the new Sovereign and his throne. But his approach is certain, though slow; and those that thrust themselves across his path will be sure to be crushed beneath his chariot wheels as they roll onward; while those that escape will be as sure to join the shouting train that accompanies his triumphal progress, and to be the loudest to sing hosannas in his praise.

Such Epochas evolve themselves slowly and with difficulty from the tumultuous and conflicting throng of human feelings and actions. But their coming is as certain as that a new day will spring from the bosom of the darkest night. To the eye of Flesh it seems as if the future would be forever as the present, that the Sun is made to stand still at the Antipodes, and they cannot be made to believe that

"To-morrow it repairs the golden flood,
And warms the nations with redoubled ray."

But to the eye of Faith, things unseen are as if they had come to pass, and the ripe perfection of the fruit is discerned in the gradual developing of the germ. The next great Epoch for the dwellers upon this continent is that of the Abolition of Slavery. That it is on its way, all signs in heaven and on earth proclaim. Is there not "upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring?" Have not the political waters of this nation been boiling like a pot for two or three years, and only because the angel of Anti-Slavery had come down and troubled them. Verily, that angel will not go up from them until Justice shall have again descended from heaven to still them. In vain is the delusive oil of Compromise poured upon them. It is but a flattering unction that seems to smooth the surface, while the great deeps are heaving themselves up from the centre.

It is obvious to all watching the progress of public affairs in this country, for the last few years, and especially for the present session of Congress, that the existing state of things cannot endure for many years longer. The end is not yet, but its beginnings may be discerned. The evil genius of our country will prevail for years to come before he is bound, and he will rage all the more fiercely because that his time is short. The fierce dissentions in the Senate Chamber upon the quarrel of the Compromise Bill were signs of life. But to what did it amount? The Bill was defeated in its totality, but its several parts seem likely to prevail one by one. The fiercest opposition to the worst demands of the tyrant power tires out by its very exertions, and at last lets the enemy get all it wants, by some legerdemain or trickery. And so the Bill for giving Texas thousands upon thousands of square miles to which she had no more right than to the *steppes* of Tartary, and paying her Ten Millions for whatever else she had the face to claim, was defeated, the other day, in the House. We were rejoicing over this strange ebulition of spirit, and auguring better things to come, but, before our caps which we had thrown into the air had time to come down again, the news comes trembling over the wires to us that all that is changed, and the bill passed by about the same majority that had just rejected it! And, anon, that New Mexico is sent back to reconsider her exclusion of Slavery, and Utah allowed to have that blessing if she choose!

Now, this must needs be so. The people at home are not yet ready to stand up boldly before the Southern bullies and dare them to do their worst. If they are not, it is too much to expect of the shadows they have projected of themselves at Washington, that they should be more solid than their substance. Especially, when examples are always ready to be made of those who dare to commit the heresy of thinking for themselves—when Palfrey has been bound upon the altar for these two years, and when the sacrificial knife is even now sharpening for the throat of Mann. As long as the Slave Power has the sceptre of dominion in its hand, so long will politicians bow down and do its bidding. While the making of Presidents is the chief end of man in this country, the main staple of the manufacture must needs be bought at any price. As long as there is meanness and servility to wear the livery of patriotism and the semblance of honorable ambition, there will be no lack of Northern tools to cleave unto the hands of Southern artificers. What alone is hopeful is the hypocrisy with which the Northern members have been forced to mask themselves, They have been obliged to seem to have "bent each corporal agent to the terrible feat" of calling their souls their own, up to the critical moment when their actual property in those unsubstantial essences was to be vindicated, when, lo! we suddenly find that they have made as clean a barter of them as Faust did of his soul, or Peter Schlemihl of his shadow.

These very tales, full of sound and fury, but signifying nothing, speak loudly of the change that is going on in the Northern mind. The bread which the Abolitionists have cast upon the waters, the world has found after many days. The facts of Slavery are becoming daily better and better understood, and a sense of their own complicity is fast sinking deeper and deeper in the Northern mind. A public sentiment is thus in the process of creation which will compel our public men at Washington to make such protestations as will effectually ruin their hopes from the South, in spite of the acts by which they are swift to contradict them. The time is coming when selfish ambition will see that the prizes at which it grasps can only be gained over the dead carcase of Slavery or in a Northern Republic free from its insidious power. What has such a man as Daniel Webster to expect from the South? True, he has sold himself to the Devil, but will he ever get his pay? They would be fools to trust him, and fools the Slaveholders have never shown themselves. It is thus that the wrath of man will be made to praise God, and his selfishness become an instrument of good. The new Epoch will not be introduced, any more than its predecessors, by men of pure hands alone. The mixture of motives which mark all human transactions will be seen in this; but it will be the whitest and loftiest monument that has yet marked the passage of the race through the Ages.—E. Q.

Loco-foco State Convention.

THE breach in the Locofoco party in this State which was nearly closed a year ago, was so carefully covered over at the State Convention last week at Syracuse that a spectator ignorant of the events of the past three years would hardly conjecture that there had ever been a disruption. There were some questions as to the titles to seats of different delegates from the same localities, but these were settled by the admission usually of both claimants, while nothing appears in the record to show that anything more than some accidental and local differences gave rise to the conflicting claims.—There was, for instance, no active principle at work in the Convention which could exclude Captain Rynders, who claimed, and was admitted to, a seat among the delegates, and on the other hand the constituents of John Van Buren, in asking for the admission of their delegate, hampered the Convention with no foregone conclusions of theirs made in accordance with the principles once known as those of the Buffalo Platform. If Hunker was not, Barnburner was remembered only as the name of an extinct genus, and agreement and harmony were proclaimed as the order of the day with, we are sorry to believe, almost entire unanimity. If there was any disagreement, there was no want of acquiescence, and if any doubted that tranquility was restored to the party, they gave as little sign of their dissent as discontented slaves would give on the announcement by the overseer that peace reigned on the plantation after every hand had received thirty lashes well laid on for disorderly conduct. Whether the peace of compulsion, or the peace of conviction, it is evident that peace prevails among the hitherto divided tents of Loco-focoism.

The Convention issued no address to the people of the State, evidently persuaded that the necessary length of such a document would clearly involve the necessity of saying something. The Convention thought best to exemplify the wisdom of silence, and this favor, and this only, we presume, was conceded to the Barnburners. It spoke and said nothing by its Resolutions, which we copy in proof of that assertion. They, and the action of them were as follows:

1. *Resolved*, That the Democratic party of New York are proud to avow their fraternity with and their devotion to the great principles of the Democratic party of the Union, as declared at the National Democratic Conventions of 1840 and 1848, and they look forward in hope and confidence to the complete triumph of that party in 1852.

2. *Resolved*, That we congratulate the country upon the recent settlement by Congress of the questions which have unhappily divided the people of these States.

3. *Resolved*, That the Democracy of the State of New York, appreciating the value of union, fraternity and concord, standing upon their ancient principles, present their candidates with a confident reliance upon the united cordial support of their principles in the State and National Councils.

4. *Resolved*, That though we urge no factious war against the constituted authorities, and as American citizens, will stand firmly by our country, by whomsoever its Government may be administered,—we regard the action of the Whig National Administration, from the first exhibitions of its proscriptive and intolerant course to the climax of the Galphin claim, as worthy of the false pretenses under which it came into power, and of professions which have been invariably violated.

5. *Resolved*, That the Whig administration of this State is the reiteration of the series of extravagancies in the public expenditures, of evasions and violations of the Constitution, and of an unsound and lavish policy, which have signalized the course of the party, which, aided by dissensions in the Democratic ranks, brought that Administration into power; and that the interests of the people and the character of the State demand a speedy return to the wise, safe and approved policy of the Democratic Administrations.

6. *Resolved*, That devoted to the principles and form of our Confederation, ever mindful of the blessings it has secured to ourselves and to mankind, and regarding the citizens of all sections of our country, as members of a common brotherhood, we cherish the Union of the States as the ark of our political covenant, and that we deprecate all sectional agitation at the North or South calculated to impair its sacred obligations or to threaten its perpetuity.

On motion being made to adopt the Committee's report, Mr. Betts of Orange moved as an amendment to the second resolution the following:

Resolved, That this Convention sincerely hope and trust that the later action of Congress will result in the final and complete settlement of all questions which have for the last ten years distracted and divided the Democratic party of the Union.

Mr. Wager of Oneida moved an amendment to the effect that without reflecting upon anybody, the Democracy of New York express their gratitude to those who have assisted by their action in Congress in the settlement of the questions.

Mr. Hart of New York moved the previous question on the adoption of the report. The Yeas and Nays being ordered, the motion was adopted, 93 to 27.

—Nothing, it will be observed, is said here directly as to the principles which were supposed to have divided the party, two years ago, and to which, it was asserted a year since, the whole Democratic party was to avow as its own, as a necessary consequence of the amalgamation of Hunkers and Barnburners at that time. The only allusion even that is made to what have been considered the distinctive differences of the two wings of the party is in the Resolution of Mr. ——— made evidently in that aggravating and malicious spirit which made it impossible to hide altogether the fact of the Hunker triumph. Indeed we hold it as an evidence of more good nature than we have given them credit for, that the Hunkers should have forborne to remind the Barnburners in a far more emphatic manner of their utter and shameless degradation, and of their own—the Hunkers'—signal and complete victory. This forbearance, perhaps, should be attributed to the more tender feelings of the country delegation, for the Rynders Faction from the city are not disposed to be mealy-mouthed, as witness the following Resolutions passed at Tammany Hall at a meeting held on the return of the city delegates from Syracuse. Here are the principles of the Loco-foco party of the State set forth in plain language, and the Free Soil party of New York is now an integral part of that body:

Resolved, That the Democracy of the city of New York have heard with joy, and congratulate their fellow-citizens upon the passage of the bills admitting California into our glorious Union, and giving Territorial Governments to New Mexico and Utah, without, in either case, the usurpation by Congress of the power to dictate to the people of California, or of the Territories, the nature or character of their domestic institutions, whereby the strict construction of the Constitution has been observed, the Wilmot Proviso defeated, the doctrine of non-intervention established, fanaticism rebuked, civil war avoided, and the Union preserved.

Resolved, That we particularly congratulate the Democracy of the Union upon the passage of these bills, because thereby their principles have triumphed, and another has been added to the many proofs in our history that the principles of the Democratic party, based upon a strict construction of the Constitution are those alone upon which the people can repose in the day of trial.

Resolved, That to Lewis Cass, Henry S. Foote, Howell, Cobb, and the many other distinguished Democrats in Congress, who have signalized their devotion to the Union by their support of these bills, we owe and feel the highest admiration and gratitude. And we are proud to know that in their great labor of pacification we gave them from the Empire State a coadjutor in Daniel S. Dickinson, who, truly representing the sentiments of our people, has borne in this memorable struggle a part so able and efficient, that while he will always be remembered by our enemies, he must never be forgotten by his friends.

Resolved, That though in the settlement of the dangerous question, which lately disturbed our peace, the principles of the Democratic party have triumphed yet the Democracy are not unmindful of the fact that they owe their success, not alone to the Democratic members of Congress, but to that magnanimous band of national Whigs, under the lead of Henry Clay and Daniel Webster, who preferred their country to their party. We tender them our sincere respect and gratitude.

Resolved, That the course of Wm. H. Seward in the Senate of the United States, in presenting petitions for the dissolution of the Union, in opposing all measures of Compromise, even at the risk of civil war, in urging the abolition of Slavery and other doctrines subversive of all law, order, and the Constitution, exhibits the short sighted cunning of the demagogue, with the recklessness of the fanatic; and we wish our fellow citizens in other States to understand that he owes his elevation to the treachery of Martin Van Buren, and that he in no manner represents the sentiments of our People.

Resolved, That the recent avowal by the Seward and Van Buren organs in this State, that the agitation of the Wilmot Proviso shall be continued, in spite of its signal condemnation by the People and by Congress should warn the People that the formation of a Geographical party, based upon a sectional issue, has not been abandoned. Let every lover of the Union watch their movements, and brand them as Traitors and Disunionists.

Resolved, That the *Journal of Commerce, Morning Herald, Daily Globe, and Truth Teller*, for

"KIDNAPPER PEARSON."—John H. Pearson, of Boston, the distinguished 'retainer' of Mr. Webster, who needed no exhortation to remember his constitutional duties, has published a letter in the *Boston Courier*, in which he denies, with a good deal of indignation, the allegation of our Boston Correspondent, 'D. Y.,' of "being cousin to D. H. Pearson," who was hung." The friends of the unfortunate man who has already suffered the extremest penalty will, no doubt, rejoice that one supposed taint in his blood is wiped out on such unquestionable authority.

MR. GIDDINGS.—We are glad to observe that the malignant charge made against Mr. Giddings by some of his enemies has been put to rest by the select Committee appointed to make investigation, who, through their Chairman, Mr. Otis, of Maine, report that there is no proof that Joshua R. Giddings, as charged, abstracted certain papers from the files of the Post Office, connected with the removal and appointment of the Postmaster at Oberlin, Ohio, and the House discharged the Committee from the further consideration of the subject.

GIFT TO W. L. CHAPLIN.—The silver pitcher which it was resolved to purchase by ten cents' subscriptions, and present to W. L. Chaplin, is, we hear on exhibition at the establishment of Jones, Ball, & Poor, in Boston. On one side of it is engraved the following inscription:

"TO
WILLIAM L. CHAPLIN, IN PRISON,
FROM
ONE THOUSAND OF HIS FRIENDS.
A Testimonial of their high regard for his Character.
August 8th, 1850."

And on the other a quotation from Scripture as follows:

"Blessed is he that considereth the poor; the Lord will deliver him in time of trouble."—Ps. xii, 1.

It is described as a handsome piece of plate, and to have cost $100.

THE Loco-focos at their State Convention at Syracuse nominated the following-named persons as their candidates at the ensuing election:

For Governor, HORATIO N. SEYMOUR: *For Lieutenant Governor*, SANFORD E. CHURCH: *For Canal Commissioner*, JOHN C. MATHER: *For Clerk of the Court of Appeals*, CHARLES S. BENTON: *For State Prison Inspector*, WILLIAM P. ANGEL.

CONGRESSIONAL.

SENATE. September, 10th.

MR. CHASE gave notice of a bill to prohibit Slavery in the Territories.

The Message of the President, received yesterday, was ordered to be printed.

After the consideration of other morning business the Bounty Land bill was taken up. An amendment by Mr. Walker, providing that the Land Warrants shall be assignable in no case whatever, was rejected—Yeas, 16, Nays, 31.

After debate the Bill was laid over.

On motion of Mr. Clay the Bill to abolish the Slave Trade in the District of Columbia was taken up. Mr. Mason moved to amend it by striking out all the bill, except so much of it as provides for the punishment of persons enticing Slaves to runaway, and giving the Corporate Authorities in the District the regulation of the residence of free people of color.

Mr. CLAY opposed the amendment briefly.

Mr. PEARCE proposed an amendment, fixing the penalty of $500 fine for bringing a slave into the District for sale, one half the sum to go to the informer, and one half to the Corporation; which, after debate, was rejected.

Mr. MASON's amendment was also rejected—Yeas 18 Nays 30

Mr. SEWARD offered the following amendment:

SEC. 1. Slavery shall forever cease within the District of Columbia, and all persons held in bondage therein shall be free. The Secretary of the Interior shall audit and pay to all persons holding slaves within the District at the time that this act takes effect, such damages as they shall suffer by the passage thereof, and the sum of two hundred thousand dollars is hereby appropriated to carry this act into execution, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

SEC. 2. An election shall be held in the District of Columbia to ascertain whether this bill is approved by the people thereof. Those who approve the act shall express their approbation by a ballot containing the words "For emancipation in the District." Those who are opposed shall vote by a ballot containing the words "Against emancipation in the District." All persons entitled to vote for any municipal officer in the District, and all citizens of the United States residing within the District permanently, shall be deemed qualified to vote at such election. Such election shall be held within six months from the passage of this act, and on public notice of not less than three months, to be given by the Marshal of the District. If a majority of the votes giving at such election shall be in favor of this act, it shall go into effect immediately. If a majority of the votes shall be against the same, this act shall be void and of none effect.

Mr. MANGUM observed that he had on repeated occasions declared himself ready to vote for the abolition of the Slave Trade in the District, he should now change his course, because he had become satisfied that nothing would satisfy certain individuals whose object seemed to be to cause a wreck of the Union, that they may raise up one in ruin.

Mr. DAWSON submitted some remarks reflecting severely by implication upon Mr. Seward, and was called to order by the Chair. He intimated that the Senator from New York fearing his inability to rise with Statesmen of either of the great parties of the day, aimed at the distraction of both as well as the Union, in order to secure his own advance.

Mr. DAYTON was not ready to vote upon this proposition at the present time; he did not think this the proper time to present the question; he hoped the amendment would be rejected.

Mr. MASON designated the proposition now presented as diff-ring from the abolition of the Slave Trade only in this, that one proposed to cut the entire rope at once and the other cut one strand. After some further debate in which the amendment was denounced—

Mr. CHASE admitted that the abolition of the Slave Trade was only one step and Southern gentlemen need not deceive themselves by the supposition that it is the last step. He knew of no principle which he espoused which he was not ready to stand by at one time as well as another.

Mr. BUTLER said he could not shut his eyes to the fact that many Senators would vote against this proposition now with a view to bringing it up at a future time.

Mr. WINTHROP said he should vote against the amendment so indiscreetly proposed by the Senator from New York. He desired to protest against being supposed to concur in the opinion that Congress had no power to abolish Slavery in the District. He read from speeches of George Mason, Patrick Henry and other fathers of the Republic to show that they fully believed that the power of Congress over the District was unlimited. Could it be then as has been declared by Mr. Foote that the carrying out of a principle so well founded was to dissolve the Union.

Pending further debate upon the amendment the Senate adjourned.

SENATE, September 11.

The Bill making compensation to the American Colonization Society for expenses incurred in sending to and supporting in Liberia for a time, the slaves liberated on the Slaver bark Pons—was taken up and ordered to be engrossed.

The Bill to abolish the Slave Trade in the District of Columbia was taken up; the question pending being upon Mr. Seward's amendment, abolishing Slavery in the District.

Mr. Seward expressed himself in favor of the original bill as reported by Mr. Clay from the Committee of Thirteen, and it was only when it appeared impossible to pass it in its original form that he offered his amendment. He understood now that the bill could be stripped of the amendment already made and passed as first introduced; desiring to vote for that measure and in the hope that it might pass, he would, with the consent of the Senate, withdraw his amendment for the present.

Mr. Dawson, as the proposition was only to adjourn temporarily, objected.

Mr. Hamblin opposed the amendment, because he desired a vote upon the abolition of the slave trade; also, because he saw no power under the Constitution to expend money for the purpose of manumitting slaves.

Mr. Clay argued in support of the bill against some of the objections made. He had always contended that Congress had unlimited power over Slavery in the District, but had at the same time held that while Slavery exists in Maryland, it would be a gross breach of good faith towards that State, to exercise the undoubted power; but the question now was in relation to the abolition of the Slave trade; and he believed that if the measure should be passed, it would give peace to Slavery in the District, until the time which seemed to him when Slavery will have worked itself out.

As to the power of abolishing this trade, it was Congress that had by its laws established Slavery in the District, and was it true that Congress had not the power to undo its own acts? Mr Clay then drew the comparison between the amendment submitted by Mr. Seward and the original bill, for the purpose of allowing that Southern men ought not to vote against the latter measure.

The amendment was debated at considerable length by Messrs. Seward, Winthrop, Foote, Davis, Butler, Hull and others, until the hour of adjournment.

SENATE, September 12.

After the consideration of morning business, the bill to Suppress the Slave Trade was taken up.

Mr. Clay appealed to Senators to allow the vote to be taken without further debate.

Mr. Soule spoke at some length, to show that Captain Ranlett's letter, read in Senate yesterday by Mr Winthrop, was totally false so far as it refers to the laws of Louisiana in relation to free negroes—seamen.

Mr. Berrien followed with similar remarks on behalf of Georgia.

Mr. Winthrop replied; and the debate was continued by Messrs. Berrien, Butler of Mass. Winthrop and Douglas. After which the question upon Mr. Seward's amendment was taken, and it was rejected. Yeas 5; Nays 45—as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Chase, Dodge, of Wisconsin, Hale, Seward, Upham.

NAYS—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Baldwin, Barnwell, Bell, Benton, Berrien, Bright, Butler, Clay, Davis, of Mass. Davis, of Miss., Dayton, Dickinson, Dodge, of Iowa, Douglas, Dowon, Ewing, Felch, Freemont, Greene, Hamlin, Gwin, Houston, Hunter, Jones, Mangum, Mason, Morton, Norris, Pierce, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Shields, Smith, Soule, Spruance, Sturgeon, Turney, Underwood, Wales, Whitcomb, Winthrop, Yulee.

The bill was then reported to the Senate.

Mr. Clay expressed the hope that the amendments made by the Senate in Committee, would be rejected, and that the bill would be passed exactly as originally reported. He feared that if the amendments were persisted in the bill would not pass—while, if they were rejected, the bill would receive the united Northern, and a majority of the Southern vote.

On motion, by Mr. Dickinson, the bill was temporarily laid upon the table, and the House bill, to supply deficiencies in the pay and mileage of members was taken up and several amendments reported by the Finance Committee, were agreed to.

SENATE, September 12

The Senate's Fugitive Slave bill was taken up and read.

Mr. Thompson, of Pa., said that, in his judgment, it was conformable to the Constitution, which was binding on all to deliver up fugitives from labor, and he proceeded to detail various sections of the bill.

He remarked that the Constitution requires the unfortunate classes who escape, to be given up by the free States.

Mr. Giddings wished to know whether the Constitution imposed any obligation upon him to be a bloodhound to hunt out the negroes.

Mr. Thompson replied, by quoting the provision of the Constitution with regard to the fugitives. If this bill is not passed, what was to prevent gentlemen from the South going to the free States and seizing their slaves.

Mr. Stevens, of Penn.,—Does this bill take away that right?

Mr. Thompson—Not at all. It provides that if the slave be rescued, the owner may summon sufficient force to recover him and restore the slave where he belongs. It could not be disguised that this bill was a part of a series of wholesome measures partly consummated, to place the States in a more peaceful relation. It gives no advantage to the kidnapper, but requires proof of the escape of a slave and property as well as the identity of the slave. For the purpose of giving the House the fullest opportunity to test their sense, he moved the Previous Question.

Mr. Stevens of Pa.—Has the bill been printed?

The Speaker—Not by the House.

Mr. Giddings wanted to say one word.

Cries of "Order," and much confusion.

Mr. Fowler—Will it be in order to move to refer the bill to the Committee of the Whole.

The Speaker said not.

Pending the demand for previous question, Mr. Crowell moved for a call of the House, which was not ordered.

The Previous Question was seconded—Ayes 87. Noes 69

Mr. Stevens of Pa moved to lay the Fugitive Slave bill on the table, but the motion did not prevail—Yeas 88, Nays 113.

The bill was ordered to a third reading—Yeas 165, Nays 74.

The bill being read a third time, and the question being now on the passage of the bill, Mr. Root moved a call of the House, which was not ordered—Yeas 73, Nays 106.

The Fugitive Slave bill was then passed—Yeas 109, Nays 75.

AYES—Messrs Albertson, Alston, Anderson, Ashe, Averett, Bay, Bayly, Beale, Bissell, Bowdon, Bowie, Bowlin, Boyd, Breck, Brown, Miss; Brown, Ind; Buel, Burt, Caldwell, N C; Caldwell, Ky; Clingman, Cobb, Ala; Colcock, Daniel, Deberry, Dick, Dunham, Edmondson, Elliot, Ewing, Featherston, Fuller, Gentry, Gerry, Gilbert, Gorman, Green, Hall, Hamilton, Haralson, Harris, Tenn; Harris, Ala; Harris, Ill; Haymond, Hibbard, Hilliard, Hoagland, Holladay, Holmes, Houston, Howard, Hubbard, Inge, Jackson, Ga; Johnson, Tenn; Johnson, Ky; Johnson Ark; Jones, Kaufman, Kerr, LaSere, Leffler, Littlefield, Mann, Pa; Marshall, Mason, McClernand, McDonald, McGaughey, McLanahan, McLean, Ky; McMullen, McQueen, McWillie, Meade, Miller, Millson, Morton, Orr, Outlaw, Owen, Parker, Peaslee, Phelps, Powell, Richardson, Robbins, Ross, Savage, Seddon, Shepherd, Stanley, Stanton, Tenn; Stanton, Ky; Taylor, Thomas, Thompson, Miss; Thompson, Pa; Thompson, Ky; Toombs, Venable, Walden, Wallace, Watkins, Welborn, Wildrick, Williams, Woodward, Young.

NAYS—Messrs. Alexander, Allen, Baker, Benett, Bingham, Booth, Briggs, Burrows, Butler, Ct; Cable, Ohio; Calvin, Campbell, Carter, Chandler, Cole, Corwin, Crowell, Dickey, Disney, Dixon, Doty, Duncan, Durkee, Evans, Ohio; Fitch, Fowler, Freedley, Geddings, Gott, Gould, Halloway, Hampton, Harlan, Hay, Hebard, Henry, Howe, Hunter, Jackson, N J; Julian, King, R. I; King, N J; John A King, Preston King, Mann, Mass; Matteson, McKissock, Meachem, Moore, Morris, Nelson, Otis, Pitman, Putnam, Reed, Robinson, Root, Rumsey, Sackett, Sawtelle, Schermerhorn, Schoolcraft, Silvester, Sprague, Stevens, Pa; Stetson, Thurman, Tuck, Underhill, Vinton, Waldo, Wentworth, Whittlesey, Wood, Wright.

Absent or not Voting.—NORTHERN WHIGS: Andrews, Ashmun, Bokee, Brooks, Butler, Casey, Clark, Conger, Duer, Goodenow, Grinnell, Levin, Nes, Newell, Ogle, Phœnix, Reynolds, Rialey, Rockwell, Rose, Schenck, Spalding, Van Dyke, White—24.

FREE SOILER: Wilmot—1.

NORTHERN LOCOS: Cleveland, Gillmore, Olds, Peck, Potter, Strong, Sweetser, Thompson of Iowa—8.

SOUTHERN WHIGS: Cabell, Evans of Md., Morehead —3.

SOUTHERN LOCOS: Ashe, Averett, Bay, Bayly, Beale, Bocock, Hackett, Harmanson, Hammond, McDowell, McLane, Morse—12.

Total absent or not voting—50.

Mr. Thompson, of Penn., moved a reconsideration, which, on his motion, was laid on the table.

After disposing of other Senate bills of no especial importance, the House adjourned.

SENATE, September 14.

After the consideration of the morning business, bill for the Suppression of the Slave Trade in the District of Columbia was taken up, on motion by Mr. Clay. The pending question being upon concurring in the amendment made by the Senate, in Committee, providing penalties for enticing slaves to escape, and giving the corporate authorities control over the ingress and egress of free people of color.

Mr. Badger advocated the amendments.

Mr. Hale wanted to know what would become of the free people of color if they were ejected from the District? The laws of the State of Maryland on one side, and Virginia on the other, prohibited free negroes from entering those State—where, then, was the ejected negro to exercise his natural right of breathing. Laughter.

Mr Clay submitted a few remarks against the amendments. He would go for proper and separate measures to carry out the objects of the amendments, but he desired the vote upon the pending bill to be based upon its own own merits. He desired that the measure should pass, but he feared it would not, if the amendments were retained.

The debate was continued at considerable length; after which the amendments of the Committee were considerably modified, on the motion of Mr. Badger, in order to meet the objections urged by Mr. Clay and others. Among these modifications was one reducing the penalty for aiding or abetting a slave to escape, to a period of not more than five year's imprisonment, which was agreed to by 25 yeas to 18 nays.

Mr. Clay still opposed the uniting of any other measure with the suppression of the Slave Trade.

The question being taken upon concurring in the amendments of the Committee, they were severally rejected, and the original bill was then under consideration as reported from the Committee of Thirteen.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, by yeas 32, nays 19, as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Baldwin, Benton, Bright, Cass, Chase, Clark, Clay, Davis, of Mass; Dayton, Dickinson, Dodge, of Wis; Dodge, of Iowa; Douglass, Ewing, Felch, Fremont, Green, Gwin, Hale, Hamlin, Jones, Norris, Seward, Shields, Smith, Spruance, Sturgeon, Underwood, Wales, Walker, Whitcomb and Winthrop.

NAYS—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Barnwell, Bell, Berrien, Butler, Davis of Miss; Dawson, Downs Hunter, King, Mason, Mangum, Morton, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Soule, Turney and Yulee.

It was discovered that a blank, designed to be filled with the date at which the act should go into effect had not been filled.

Mr. Clay hoped it would be filled by unanimous consent. Messrs. Mason and Davis of Miss. objected.

Mr. Clay moved a reconsideration of the engrossment which was agreed to.

The blank was filled with "1st of January, 1850," and the bill was ordered to be engrossed.

The Senate then adjourned.

SENATE, September 16.

The bill to Suppress the Slave Trade in the District of Columbia, was read a third time. The question being stated upon its passage,

Mr. Benton briefly addressed the Senate. He observed that it had been seen that each and every one of the measures reported by the Committee of Thirteen had been passed. He had from the first opposed their conjunction in one bill or as one measure. The argument in favor of such conjunction was that they would pass more speedily. He had contended that such course could only cause delay. Now that each separate measure had passed the accuracy of his view was made manifest, and it was proved that seven months of the session had been entirely thrown away in an attempt to do that which was unparliamentary, unjust and impracticable. While these cats and dogs were tied together by their tails, they fought and struggled almost to the destruction of each other, but as soon as separated each ran off to his own hole without further trouble. [Great laughter.] By looking over the votes upon the several measures it would be found that only 17 Senators voted for all the measures. Mr. Clay, who was absent, being counted, made 18. This he held was the true state of the Omnibus of the Committee of Thirteen. Only four from the free States, Messrs. Cass, Cooper, Dickinson and Bright voted for all these measures. No better evidence of the truth of his position could be given.

Mr. Clay thought the events of the last five weeks not proper subjects of individual triumphs. They were the triumphs of the country, of the Union, of harmony and of peace. The question of uniting or separating the measures was the veriest question of form imaginable, and if it had not been for the opposition to this simple question of form, the combined measures would, in his opinion, have all passed. Now that was the only point of importance.

Mr. Benton denied the right of any man to come into the Senate with a plan of action and say that none other than that should be adopted.

Mr. Foote urged that public sentiment upon all these measures had been modified in consequence of the discussion of these combined measures, and that if it had not been for these combined measures and this continued discussion, the measures would never have passed, either separately or in any other form. If there ever had been any one who for many years had played the tyrant in the Senate, he rejoiced that they might now say, behold the tyrant prostrate in the dust and Rome again is free. [Applause.]

Mr. Dickinson defended the late combination of measures. If any one of them had been taken up alone, it would have created a sectional feeling, and discussion would have prevented proper action upon any of them. It was a good plan to bring the questions all under consideration at one time. He admitted that generally the proper course was to consider such question by itself, but under these extraordinary circumstances, the combination was wise and proper.

After further debate, the bill was passed yeas 33 nays 19.

GOV. SEWARD'S SPEECH.

FREEDOM IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

United States Senate, Washington, Wednesday September 10.

The bill for the suppression of the Slave Trade in the District of Columbia being under consideration, the pending question was stated upon the following amendment submitted by Mr. Seward:

Mr. SEWARD submitted the following as a substitute for the whole bill, after the enacting clause:

"SEC. 1. Slavery shall forever cease within the District of Columbia and all persons held in bondage therein shall be free. The Secretary of the Interior shall audit and pay to all persons holding slaves within the District at the time that this act takes effect, such damages as they shall suffer by the passage thereof, and the sum of two hundred thousand dollars is hereby appropriated to carry this act into execution, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

"SEC. 2. An election shall be held in the District of Columbia to ascertain whether this bill is approved by the people thereof. Those who approve the act shall express their approbation by a ballot containing the words 'For Emancipation in the District.' Those who are opposed, shall vote by ballot, containing the words, 'Against Emancipation in the District.' All persons entitled to vote for any municipal officer in the District, and all citizens of the United States residing within the District permanently, shall be deemed qualified to vote at such election. Such election shall be held within six months from the passage of this act, and on public notice of not less than three months, to be given by the Marshal of the District. If a majority of the votes given at such election, shall be in favor of this act, it shall go into effect immediately. If a majority of the votes shall be against the same, this act shall be void and of no effect."

Mr. S. rose and said: Mr. President—In submitting so grave a proposition as this, I am aware that it would have been no unreasonable demand on the patience of the Senate, or that of the country, to have asked for time enough to explain the policy of the measure, and to defend the form in which it is submitted. But there remain only fifteen secular days of this session of Congress, and in my judgment the time has come for debate to cease and action to go on. For this reason I forebore from debate on offering the amendment. And I forebore also, because at an early stage of the session I had discussed at large all the principles involved in the measure I had another reason for that forbearance. Speaking for myself alone, and imputing no prejudice and no injustice to others, I may be allowed to remark that the abolition of Slavery everywhere seems to me a just and wise policy, provided it can be effected without producing injury outweighing its benefits. Opposition to Emancipation in the District of Columbia, therefore, seemed to me to be a bad cause; and it is the nature of a bad cause to betray itself. I did not err, then, in supposing that the opposition which my proposition would encounter would prove its best vindication.

Influenced by these considerations I shall not now address myself to the broad merits of the question, but shall be content with simply adverting to points which have been made during the present debate.

The first point was made by the honorable Senator from Georgia. (Mr. Dawson) with the concurrence of some other Senators, and consisted in the improper or bad motives which they saw fit to impute to the author of the measure. Sir, the great instructor in the art of reasoning (Lord Bacon) teaches that it is always better to answer to the "matter" of an adversary than to his "person." The imputation of motives does not fall within that rule, and therefore it falls at my feet. The measure I have submitted is either right or wrong. If right, no unworthiness of motive of mine can detract from its merits. If wrong, no purity of motive can redeem it.

The second point is that which has been so fully argued by the honorable and distinguished Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. Clay,) viz.: that Congress has no power to abolish Slavery in the District of Columbia. I find that power in the Constitution; and it is defined by these words: "To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such District, not exceeding ten miles square, as may by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States."

The District of Columbia is that district not exceeding ten miles square. It has become the seat of the Government of the United States by cession of the State of Maryland accepted by Congress. It is of the very nature of the power that it is exclusive and applies to all cases whatsoever, whenever the District becomes in the manner defined the Seat of Government of the United States Senate. This I think is a conclusive answer to the argument of the Hon Senator from Kentucky. But is it limited by an implied understanding that it should not be exercised to abolish Slavery? Neither could the State of Maryland make, nor could the United States yield, such a reservation.

An *exclusive* power is that power which is possessed and may be exercised independently of all other sovereignties on earth. Congress then having exclusive power has absolute sovereignty, unless cases be excepted in which it shall not be exercised. But such exceptions are excluded by the broad expression "in all cases whatsoever."

Those who framed the Constitution were fully aware of the extent of the power which it conferred. Mr. Madison thus describes it in the 43d number of the *Federalist*:

"The indispensable necessity of complete authority at the seat of Government carries its own evidence with it. It is a power exercised by every Legislature of the Union, I might say of the world—by virtue of its general supremacy."

Yes, sir, it is a *complete*, not an imperfect power. It is a power over the District equal to any authority which can be exercised by any Legislature of "any State in this Union," or by any Legislature of any State or nation "*in the world*." It is a power described in the philosophy of Government as "*summum imperium summum modo*," a power, within the region of its exercise, complete, absolute, universal. Now every Legislature in this Union, every sovereign authority in the world, has the power to abolish Slavery. More than half of the States in this Union have abolished or prohibited it. France England and Mexico have abolished and prohibited it. Congress can do in the District of Columbia what they have done within their respective dominions.

I dwell upon this point only a moment longer. Slavery within the District of Columbia exists only by the action of Congress. Instead of pursuing the argument further to prove that Congress has the power to make a freeman, I demand proof that Congress possesses the power to make a slave, or hold man in bondage. All the other points which have been raised apply not to the merits of the proposition for Emancipation, but only to the form and manner of carrying it into effect. Such were the objections raised by my honorable and esteemed friend from Connecticut (Mr, Baldwin) and my no less honorable and esteemed friend from Massachusetts, (Mr. Winthrop.) It will be seen at once that these objections concede that the principle of the measure is right. Nevertheless, without holding those gentlemen to this concession, but leaving them to judge and act for themselves, I shall be content to reply to them so far only as to vindicate the plan of Emancipation embodied in the amendment. What then is the form, and what the manner proposed? The amendment declares that Slavery shall forever cease in the District of Columbia, and that all persons held in bondage therein when the act shall go into effect, shall be free. It directs the Secretary of the Interior to pay the damages which any persons holding slaves within the District shall incur by reason of its passage, and it appropriates $200,000 as a fund for that purpose. The amendment further provides for an election in which the qualified and competent citizens of the District shall express their approbation or disapprobation of the act. If they disapprove it, it shall be void and of no effect.

I submit, sir, in the first place, that the plan is *adequate*. It will secure the abolition of Slavery within the District, if it obtains the consent of those who are most particularly concerned in the question. I have not learned from either of my honorable friends that he is in favor of emancipating the slaves without the consent of the people in the District, and we have all heard other honorable Senators insist upon that consent as indispensable. I do not insist upon it for myself. I have only surrendered so much to their objections; but if a majority of the Senate should waive the objection, it would give me pleasure to modify the plan accordingly.

Second: The plan is an equal one. While it confers upon the slave the inestimable boon of freedom, it awards to him who, by authority of Congress, has hitherto held him in bondage, a just remuneration and indemnity for his loss. It is then adequate and equal.

Thirdly, the plan is not violent nor capricious, but deliberate and prudent; for it makes this solemn transaction to depend upon a canvass, to be continued not less than three months, nor more than six months, among the people of the District.

Fourthly, the plan is broad enough. I am informed by, I believe, creditable evidence, that the number of slaves within the District, as ascertained by the Census, male and female, old and young, great and small, is about 600, and that their value is estimated, by those who regard them as subjects of traffic, as I certainly do not, at $300 for each person, or in the aggregate $180,000.

The amendment appropriates two hundred thousand dollars. If the sum is two great, nothing will be lost. If it be too small, the deficiency can be now or afterward supplied.

But my Honorable friend from Massachusetts (Mr. Winthrop objects that the amendment contains no provision for the support of the slaves or of any of them after their emancipation. Sir, if I could admit that this objection had weight, it would be a sufficient answer that, in the judgment of other Senators, such a provision would only tend to defeat the object in view. If those honorable Senators think I err in this, let them submit such a provision, and if it do not embarrass the bill it shall receive my vote.

But I think the objection itself is not well grounded. The slave is held in bondage not for his own support and his own benefit, but for the support and benefit of his master. It is the slave then that supports and contributes to the support of the master, and not the master that supports the slave. It is not in humanity that it should be otherwise. Relieve the slave then from the support of his master, and his whole energies will be directed to making provision for himself and his own family. The instincts of the common nature which he shares with us will do the rest. But you may reply that these persons are degraded so as to be unable to take care of themselves. On the contrary, it is in this District that the institution assumes its most cheerful, or least repulsive aspect.—Here in the center of the Union, in the Capital of this free Empire, the African race has been held in bondage from generation to generation through a period of near two hundred years. We all trust, we all believe that the ultimate result of the transfer of this foreign population to our own shores is to be the bringing of them into a condition to support themselves and to exercise the privileges of self-government. It is a sad commentary upon the operation of our institutions to say that two hundred years have not been enough to bring these six hundred persons, under such favorable auspices, to the capability of providing for their own daily wants.

The next objection to the measure which I shall notice is that it is an indiscreet one. This I think was the language of my honorable friend from Mass. (Mr. Winthrop). The objection implies assent to the justice and wisdom of the measure itself, and takes issue only upon the time, occasion or circumstances, under which it is proposed. It concedes, moreover, that it would be proper at a different time, on some other occasion, or in some other circumstances.

Let us see, then, wherein the indiscretion consists. And first, as to the occasion. One honorable Senator (Mr. Winthrop) says that by supporting it on this occasion we should incur the risk of loosing the bill itself which is proposed to be amended, and thus losing the abolition of the Slave Trade within the District of Columbia. Suppose we do. What would be the loss?—The amendment before you secures the abolition of the Slave trade, for it abolishes Slavery altogether. When Slavery falls, the trade, which is only an incident of it, will undoubtedly cease. But the Senator is afraid that between the two both will be lost. That cannot happen. The passage of either accomplishes the object in view. If the amendment shall pass, you will have a better bill than the bill of the Committee of Thirteen. If the amendment shall fail, you will still have the bill of the Committee of Thirteen.

But the bill of the Committee of Thirteen is not put in jeopardy. It is lost or worse than lost to us already. If it had not been, I should not have offered my proposition as an amendment. The abolition of the slave trade indeed remains in the bill, but conditions have been annexed which cannot be accepted, and which compel us of the Free States to reject the bill itself.—One of these conditions is the converting into a felony, punishable with ten years' imprisonment, the act of aiding or favoring the escape of a fugitive slave, or even the act of harboring a slave, with a view to aid his escape. The punishment already denounced by the law is severe enough, in my judgment, for an act that is wrong, not because it is iniquitous in itself, but only because it is declared by the statute to be wrong.

The second condition which has been annexed to the bill is the conferring of a right upon the corporations of the District to impose conditions upon which freed men shall be allowed to enter and remain in the District or depart form it—in other words, to *proscribe* free men who are citizens of the United States and of the free States. By the addition of these conditions, the bill has been converted from a law meliorating Slavery within the District into a law to fortify Slavery and proscribe free men. When that was done, my last hope, my last purpose, my last thought of supporting the bill was gone. And yet this is the bill which the Honorable Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Winthrop) complains that I am putting in jeopardy. This, Sir, and nothing other or different from this, is the boon which he says is just within our grasp, and which I have struck down to the earth. Sir, when my amendment shall have been rejected this bill will still remain I want to see whether he will embrace it, and take it to his bosom. I shall not believe it. It would sting me to death.

So much, Sir, for the occasion. And now for the indiscretion, so far as it depends upon time and circumstances. I think it wrong to hold men in bondage at any time and under any circumstances. I think it right and just, therefore, to abolish Slavery wherever we have the power at any time, at all times, under any circumstances. Now, Sir, so far as the objection rests upon the time when this measure is proposed, I beg leave to say that if the present is not the right time, then there must be or must have been some other time, when it would be or would have been right. That other time must be a time that is already passed, or a time yet to come. Well, Sir, Slavery has existed here, under the sanction of Congress, for 50 years undisturbed.—The right time then has not passed. It must, therefore, be a future time. Will gentlemen oblige me and the country by telling us how far down in the Future the right time lies? When will it come? Will it be the next year, or at the end of the next half century, or of the next hundred years? When will it be discreet to bring before Congress and the people the abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia? Sir, let not Senators delude themselves. I had the honor to submit to the Senate some weeks ago a proposition to admit New Mexico as a State. It was rejected then by a vote unanimous, except my own—those who were in favor of the measure voting with its opponents because it was not the right time.

They said the Constitution had not been officially received. It was not a fit occasion. The measure was offered as an amendment to the bill. Sir, the Constitution was officially received yesterday, and the Senators of the State were in waiting. But New Mexico in the meantime had been organized as a Territory, and her State Constitution is not even honored with a reference. There is no right time for New Mexico to enter the Union as a Free State. So, Sir, it will be with the abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia. The right time, if it be not now, will never come. Sir, each Senator must judge for himself. Judging for myself, I am sure the right time has come. Past the middle age of life, it has happened to me now, for the first time, to be a legislator for Slaves. I believe it to be my duty to restore them to Freedom. For the performance of such a duty, the first time and the first occasion which offers, is the right time. The people who sent me here knew my opinions and my principles on that subject. If I waived this time and this occasion, such is the uncertainty of human life and of human events, that no other may ever offer themselves to me. I could not return to the People who sent me here, nor could I go before my Maker, having been here, without having humbly but firmly endeavored to discharge that great obligation.

Sir, I can spare one word of reply, not to the wretched imputation that I seek by this measure to dissolve the Union of these States, but to the argument that the measure itself tends to so disastrous a consumation.—This Union is the feeblest and weakest national power that exists on earth; if, with twenty million of freemen, it cannot bear the shock of adding six hundred to their number. The Union stands, as I have demonstrated at large on former occasions, not upon a majority of voices in either or both Houses of Congress upon any measure whatever, but upon enduring physical, social and political necessities, which will survive all the questions of this day, and will survive after the extinction of Slavery, not only in the District of Columbia, but throughout the world. Others may try to save it by concessions to Slavery, from imaginary perils. I shall still seek to perpetuate it by rendering its power beneficient to all classes and conditions of mankind.

Miscellanea.

AT a meeting of the "West Chester (Pa.) Young Men's Temperance and Literary Association," held on the evening of the 29th ultimo, the following preamble and resolutions, in respect to the death of James Fulton, jr. were unanimously adopted:

The Great Disposer of human events, having taken from the sphere of his usefulness, our esteemed fellow-citizen and friend, James Fulton, jr. we cannot omit the opportunity thus presented, to express our feelings in relation to so melancholy an event; and to exhibit a proper regard for the virtues that distinguished him, and for those benefits he so ardently labored to obtain for society.

His were noble and lofty aims. Every purpose of a grovelling nature he cast aside, and considered the good of his race as the paramount consideration of the citizen. To effect this good he severely labored, and found happiness in the sacrifices that he made for so great an end. Where others acted from considerations of cold duty, he pursued a benevolent purpose with intense ardor, fought the battle of opinion and philanthropy, as if victory depended upon his single strength, and with a heroic confidence that truth must sooner or later prevail.

During his life he struggled for the ascendancy of principle only; and those principles which he so faithfully advocated, could justly be said to be always consonant to the best interests of his mind. He desired to debase none, but to enoble and elevate all. Adopting the doctrine of a sage of old, he deemed "a wrong done to the meanest citizen as a wrong to the whole community." He could not brook oppression in any shape. Day and night he thought, and wrote, and pleaded, and purposed against it. It received from him, at all times, an earnest, steady, and uncompromising hate. But it was oppression and debasing principle only that he hated. Towards his fellow man his heart was as warm as it was brave. To his philanthropy none could plead in vain. His was the open hand to all that approached him, of all climes, and of every degree. His smile was always the smile of kindness, his language the language of benevolence, and his home the home of all that sought its threshhold.

His heart was truly American. He mourned over everything that tended to degrade his country. Every doctrine that he proposed for her good contained an elevated sentiment. Her oppressions he rebuked sternly—severely; but her institutions he loved and admired. He battled with nothing but what tended to the debasement of her children, and to render her criminal in the estimation of the world. In all else he labored for her, and desired her glory to be founded upon justice, and her prosperity to be connected with nothing that tended to deprive the citizen of his rights. The right of one man he considered the right of all men; and neither the plausibility of the sophist, the frown of corrupt public opinion, nor the sneer of the malevolent, could ever swerve him from an advocacy of his doctrine.

He was an honest and independent man. He did not look with timid and ill-timed caution to observe in which direction the breeze of popular opinion was tending. He did not, like the mass, mark the course of the current to glide smoothly with it. Such was foreign to his nature. It was the intrinsic value of principle that always enchained his attention, awoke his ardor, and inspired his efforts. If he recognized the principle as noble and exalted, he made it his, whether popular or not; without pausing to inquire what might be the nature or extent of the odium that the wickedness of others might heap upon him. With talent that might have fitted him for a higher sphere of action, he disclaimed the shuffling and trickery that was necessary to catch the popular eye. The tyranny of political partizanship, the ambition of rule and influence; and the spoils of power, he cast to the winds. The path of advancement to honors, which his mind well qualified him to attain, presented to him no seductions. He could not yield to the caution and policy and servility of that condition of things that he found in the political world. He desired to be free, in thought, in [illegible] pose; as an American citizen in a free and enlightened age.

Though born and educated in a secluded condition, and courting and enjoying seclusion, his thoughts and aspirations bounded to the remotest verge of his country. Bred to the noble occupation of the farmer, he ever turned the furrow of thought whilst his ploughshare was turning the furrow of the field. Amid his daily toil, he was ever planning the means of impressing the principles he had espoused upon the public mind; and in his retired hours, the same busy and teeming purposes pressed upon him. He never rested. Life to him was one continuous, unbroken toil, of both body and mind. His was a spirit that could not rest whilst his country was deemed an oppressor, or whilst evil principle kept the ascendancy of virtue. He combined in himself, too, a noble example of an American workingman, studying to develop a mental energy, whilst pursuing the labor of the farmer. He well knew and appreciated the virtue of this combination. But to this combination of toil and study, he added the still nobler pursuit of philanthropy. He did not develop his mind for a mere literary pleasure; in all he studied to accomplish some generous aim—something that would alleviate the misery of others, and strengthen his own heart in moral virtue.

To the sufferings of the African race, his heart was especially drawn out. For their amelioration and freedom he incessantly labored. To the claim of *property in man*, he returned an indignant denial. He bade the panting and trembling fugitive from tyranny a cordial welcome to his homestead, and a "*God's speed*" to a secure asylum. All compacts that tread man's inalienable rights in the dust, he spurned, and he recognized nothing of system, or law, or institution, that made him a slave. Standing above the stern prejudices of society, he studied clearly and well the profound doctrine of human rights, and repudiated the paradox that one race possessed the monopoly of freedom. Civil and religious liberty to him was the vital air of the citizen—the school in which he was to learn greatness and virtue. He believed that Government was under religious obligations to protect and elevate all within the reach of her power, and that so far as she came short of this duty, she lessened in greatness.

The very principles that made him the enemy of debasing custom, or law, in one case, made him so in others. He could not brook to see man the slave of another—his physical and intellectual vigor objects of marketable value; neither could he look, but with a scornful eye, when he was bound in the thrall of his own corru

Poetry.

ON!

FROM the dark and troubled surges
Of the roaring sea of time,
Evermore a word emerges,
Solemn, beautiful, sublime.
So of old, from Grecian water,
'Mid the music and the balm,
Rose the dread Olympian's daughter,
Floating on the azure calm.

Evermore the worlds are fading,
Evermore the worlds will bloom,
To refute our weak upbraiding,
To throw brightness on the gloom.
Ever the imperfect passes,
But the perfect ever grows;
Forests sink to drear morasses,
Fairer landscapes to disclose.

All the beauty, all the splendor,
Of the ancient earth and sky,
Graceful form and persons tender,
All have passed in silence by.
Man the fairest, man the youngest,
Man, the darling of the Gods,
With the weakest, with the strongest,
Travels to the still abodes.

All his brothers, unlamenting,
To the eternal plan conform,
Fall unqualing, unrepenting,
In the calm and in the storm.
Man, too, with a quiet bearing,
With brave heart and steadfast eye,
Undisturbed and undespairing,
Yes, with noble joy, must die!

Has he shared what nature proffered?
Gladly taken what she gave?
Now the one last gift is offered,
Let him take that gift—the grave.
With a grand renunciation,
Let him leave to earth and sun,
For another generation,
All the good that he hath done.

Knowing that the laws eternal,
Never, never, can deceive;
Raised above the sphere diurnal,
And too noble, far, to grieve.
Glad that he has been the agent,
Of the universal heart,
That, in life's majestic pageant,
He has played no worthless part.

So a great and holy feeling
Shall sustain his human soul,
And, a silent strength revealing,
Shall the part reseek the whole.
It shall change, but shall not perish,
Now in life and now in death,
For what most we love and cherish,
Dies to breath a nobler breath.

—*Glasgow Examiner.*

THE HEART'S CHARITY.

BY ELIZA COOK.

A RICH man walked abroad one day,
And a poor man walked the selfsame way.
When a pale and starving face came by,
With a pallid lip and a hopeless eye,
And that starving face presumed to stand,
And ask for bread from the rich man's hand;
But the rich man sullenly looked askance,
With a gathering frown and a doubtful glance.
"I have nothing," said he, "to give you,
Nor any such rogue of a canting crew;
Get work. Get work! I know full well
The whining lies that beggars can tell"
And he fastened his pocket, and on he went,
With his soul untouched and his conscience content.

Now this great owner of golden store
Had built a church not long before,
As noble a fane as man could raise,
And the world had given him thanks and praise;
And all who beheld it lavished fame
On his Christian gift and godly name.

The poor man passed, and the white lips dared
To ask of him if a mite could be spared;
The poor man gazed on the beggar's cheek,
And saw what the white lips could not speak
He stood for a moment, but not to pause
On the truth of the tale, or the parish laws.
He was seeking, to give—though it was but small,
For a penny, a single penny was all:
But he gave it with a kindly word,
While the warmest pulse in his breast was stirred:
'Twas a tiny seed his Charity shed,
But the white lips got a taste of bread,
And the beggar's blessing hallowed the crust
That came like a spring in the desert dust.

The rich man and the poor man died,
As all of us must, and they were tried
At the sacred Judgment seat above,
For their thoughts of evil and deeds of love.
The balance of Justice *there* was true,
And fairly bestowed what fairly was due,
And the two fresh comers through Heaven's gate
Stood there to learn their eternal fate.
The recording angels told of things
That fitted them both with kindred wings;
But as they stood in the crystal light,
The plumes of the rich man grew less bright.
The angels knew, by that shadowy sign,
That the poor man's work had been most divine;
And they brought the unerring scales to see
What the rich man's falling off could be.

Full many deeds did the angels weigh,
But the balance kept an even sway;
And at last the church endowment laid
With its thousands promised and thousands paid,
With the thanks of prelates by its side,
In the stately words of pious pride;
And it weighed so much that the angels stood
To see how the poor man could balance such good.
A cherub came and took his place
By the empty scale, with radiant grace,
And he dropped the penny that had fed
White starving lips with a crust of bread.
The church endowment went up with the beam,
And the whisper of the Great Supreme,
As he beckoned the poor man to his throne,
Was heard in this immortal tone—
"Blessed are they who from great pain
Give thousands with a reasoning brain,
But holier still shall be his part
Who gives one coin with pitying heart."

A PRAYER FOR SABBATH OBSERVANCE.

LORD! grant to poor o'er-labor'd man
More leisure, and less pray'r;
More church, less priest—and homes for inns!
More libraries, and fewer sins;
More music, and less care!

And when the tardy Sabbath dawn,
Bid townsmen leave behind
The goldfinch, smother'd on his perch,
Gin-shop and chapel, jail and church,
And drink the mountain wind.

Or teach the artisan to seek
Some village house of pray'r,
And kneel (an apparition pale,
Amid the rustics red and hale),
And humbly worship there.

Or bid him (in the temple, built
By skill divine for all)
Expound to pallid listeners near,
While rose-cheek'd pilgrims stop to hear,
The words of Christ or Paul.—*Ebenezer Elliott*

Miscellany.

THE HIPPOPOTAMUS.

BEFORE we give a more exclusive attention to the "illustrious stranger," we think it will be advisable to present the reader with a brief authentic account of the circumstances which led to the honor conferred upon England by the visit of this extraordinary personage. These circumstances are little known to the world; indeed, we have reason to believe they have never before been published.

The British Consul at Cairo had frequently intimated to His Highness the Pasha of Egypt, that a live hippopotamus would be regarded as a very interesting and valuable present in England. Now, there were sundry difficulties of a serious nature involved in this business. In the first place, the favorite resort of the hippopotami is a thousand or fifteen hundred miles distant from Cairo; in the second place, the hippopotamus being amphibious, is not easily come-at-able; when he is environed, he is a tremendous antagonist, by reason of his great strength, enormous weight, his wrathfulness when excited, and we may add his prodigious mouth with its huge tusks. We are speaking of the *male* hippopotamus. He is often slain by a number of rifle-balls (he only makes a comic grin of scorn at a few) and laid low from a distance: but as to being taken alive, that is a triumph which has scarcely ever been permitted to mortal man of modern times. It is quite a different matter in respect of the elephant. He cannot take to the water, and neither dive clean away, nor upset your boat with a plunge of his forehead; besides which, you cannot get two tame renegade hippopotami to assist in the capture and subjugation of a relation, as in the case with elephants. Accordingly, His Highness the Pasha, not liking to compromise the dignity of despotism, and his own position as sovereign of Egypt, by promising anything which he might, perhaps, be unable to perform, turned a deaf ear to the repeated overtures of the British Consul. He never refused his request: he simply did not hear what he said, or could not be made to have a clear understanding as to what the Consul really wanted. His Highness had already given him the skin and bones of hippopotami, and many other animals alive and dead. If he wished for any birds, he was welcome to as many as he pleased!

It so chanced, however, that Abbas Pasha took it into his head, or somebody told him, that we had in England several extraordinary breeds of dogs, horses and cows—hounds that could catch a gazelle by sheer fleetness, small fighting-dogs that would master a bull—horses that could compete with his finest Arabian steeds, and beat them in a hard day's hunt over rough ground. He bethought himself, therefore, of the hippopotamus. One good turn of this kind might deserve another of a different kind.

"So, Consul," said the Pasha abruptly one day, when Mr. Murray was dining with him, "so, you want a hippopotamus?"

"Very much, your Highness."

"And you think that such an animal would be an acceptable present to your Queen and country?"

"He would be accounted a great rarity," said the Consul; "our naturalists would receive him with open arms—figuratively speaking—and the public would crowd to pay their respects to him."

Abbas Pasha laughed at this pleasantry of the Consul. "Well," said he, "we will inquire about this matter." He half-turned his head over one shoulder to his attendants: "Send here the Governor of Nubia!" The attendants thus ordered made their salam, and retired.

Anybody, not previously aware of the easy habits of a despotic sovereign, would naturally conclude that the Governor of Nubia was, at this time, in Cairo, and at no great distance from the royal abode. But it was not so. The Governor of Nubia was simply there—at home—smoking his pipe in Nubia. This brief and unadorned order, therefore, involved a poste-haste messenger on a dromedary across the Desert, with a boat up the Nile, and then more dromedaries, and then another boat, and again a dromedary, till the Pasha's mandate was delivered. We next behold the Governor of Nubia, in full official trim, proceeding poste-haste with his suite across the Desert, and down the Nile, travelling day and night, until finally he is announced to the Pasha, and admitted to his most serene and fumigatious presence. The Governor makes his grand salam.

"Governor," says the Pasha—and we have this unique dialogue on the best authority—"Governor, have you hippopotami in your country?"

"We have, your Highness."

Abbas Pasha reflected a moment: then said—"Send to me the Commander of the Nubian army. Now, go!"

This was the whole dialogue. The Governor made his salam, and retired. With the same haste and ceremony, so far as the two things can be combined, he returned to Nubia by boat, and dromedary, and horse, and covered litter; and the same hour found the Commander of the army of Nubia galloping across the Desert with his attendants, in obedience to the royal mandate.

The Pasha, knowing that all means of speed will be used, and what those means will be, together with the nature of the route, is able to calculate to a day when the Commander ought to arrive—and therefore *must* arrive—at his peril, otherwise. The British Consul is invited to dine with his Highness on this day.

Duly, as expected, the Commander of the Nubian army arrives, and is announced, just as the repast is concluded. He is forthwith ushered into the presence of the sublime beard and turban. Coffee and pipes are being served. The Commander makes his grand salam, shutting his eyes before the royal pipe.

"Commander," says the Pasha, without taking his pipe from his mouth, "I hear that you have hippopotami in your country."

"It is true, your Highness; but——"

"Bring me a live hippopotamus—a young one. Now, go!"

This was actually the dialogue which took place on the occasion—and the whole of it. The Commander of the Nubian forces made his grand salam—retired—and returned as he came—"big" with the importance of his errand—but also not without considerable anxiety for its result.

Arriving at Dongola, the Commander summoned his chief officers and captains of the Nubian hosts to a council of war on the subject of the hippopotamus hunt, on the result of which—he intimated—several heads were at stake, besides his own. A similar communication was speedily forwarded to the chief officers of the right wing of the army, quartered in their tents at Sennaar. The picked men of all the forces having been selected, the two parties met in boats at an appointed village on the banks of the Nile, and there concerted their measures for the expedition.

The Commander divided the chosen body into several parties, and away they sped up the Nile. They followed the course of the river, beyond the point where it branches off into the Blue Nile, and the White Nile. Good fortune at length befell one of the parties; but this cost much time, and many unsuccessful efforts—now pursuing a huge savage river-horse, with rifle-balls and flying darts; now pursued by him in turn with foaming jaws and gnashing tusks—all of which may readily be conjectured, from the fact that they did not fall in with their prize till they had reached a distance, up the White Nile, of one thousand five hundred miles above Cairo. In the doublings and re-doublings of attack and retreat, of pursuit and flight, and renewed assault, they must of course have traversed, in all, at least two thousand miles.

Something pathetic attaches to the death of the mother of "our hero"—something which touches our common nature, but which such hunters as Mr. Gordon Cumming would not be at all able to understand. A large female hippopotamus being wounded, was in full flight up the river; but presently a ball or two reached a mortal part, and then the maternal instinct made the animal pause. She fled no more, but turned aside, and made towards a heap of brushwood and water-bushes that grew on the banks of the river, in order (as the event showed) to die beside her young one. She was unable to proceed so far, and sank dying beneath the water. The action, however, had been so evidently caused by some strong impulse and attraction in that direction, that the party instantly proceeded to the clump of water-bushes. Nobody moved—not a green flag stirred; not a sprig trembled; but directly they entered, out burst a burly young hippopotamus-calf, and plunged head foremost down the river-banks. He had all but escaped, when, amidst the excitement and confusion of the picked men, one of them who had "more character" than the rest, made a blow at the slippery prize with his boat-hook, and literally brought him up by burying the hook in his fat black flank. Two other hunters—next to him in presence of mind and energy—threw their arms round the great barrel-bellied infant, and hoisted him into the boat, which nearly capsized with the weight and struggle.

In this one circumstance of a hippopotamus being ordered by his Highness Abbas Pasha, has been pleasantly shown the ease and brevity with which matters are managed by a despotic government. We complain at home—and with how much reason, everybody knows too well—of the injurious and provoking slowness of all good legislative acts; but here we have a beautiful little instance, or series of little instances, of going rather too fast. Things are settled off-hand in the East by a royal mandate—from the strangling of a whole seraglio, to the suckling of a young hippopotamus.

Returning down the Nile with their unwieldy prize, for whose wounded flank the best surgical attendance the country afforded was of course procured, it soon became a matter of immense importance and profound consultation as to how and on what the innocent young monster should be fed. He would not touch flesh of any kind; he did not seem to relish fruit; and he evidently did not, at present, understand grass. A live fish was put into his mouth, but he instantly gave a great gape and allowed it to flap its way out again and fall into the water. Before long, however, the party reached a village. The Commander of the army saw what to do. He ordered his men to seize all the cows in the village, and milk them. This was found very acceptable to their interesting charge, who presently despatched a quantity that alarmed them, lest they should be unable to keep up the due balance of supply and demand. The surplus milk, however, they carried away in gourds and earthern vessels. But they found it would not keep: it became sour butter, and melted into oil. They were, therefore, compelled, after a milking, to carry off with them one of the best cows. In this way they returned across hundred miles down the Nile, stopping at every village on their way—seizing all the cows and milking them dry. By these means they managed to supply the "table" of the illustrious captive, whose capacities in disposing of the beverage appeared to increase daily.

The hunting-division of the army, headed by the Commander-in-Chief, arrived at Cairo with their prize on the 14th of November, 1849. The journey down the Nile, from the place where he was captured, viz., the White Nile, had occupied between five and six months. This, therefore, with a few additional days, may be regarded as the age of our hippopotamus on reaching Cairo. The color of his skin, at that time, was for the most part of a dull, reddish to...e, very like that (to compare great things with small) of a naked new-born mouse. The Commander hastened to the palace to report his arrival with the prize to his royal master, into the charge of whose officers he most gladly resigned it. His Highness, having been informed of the little affair of the succession of "cows," determined to place the vivacious un-weaned "infant prodigy" in the hands of the British Consul without a moment's delay

The announcement was accordingly made with the oriental formality by the chief officer of Abbas Pasha's palace, to whom the Honorable Mr. Murray made a suitable present in return for the good tidings. A lieutenant of the Nubian army, with a party of soldiers, arrived shortly after, bringing with them the animal, whose renown had already filled the whole city. He excited full as much curiosity in Cairo as he has since done here, being quite as great a rarity. This will be easily intelligible when the difficulties of the capture, and the immense distance of the journey are taken into consideration, with all the contingencies of men, boats provisions cows, and other necessary expenses.

The overjoyed consul had already made all his preparations for receiving the illustrious stranger. He had, in the first place, secured the services of Hamet Safi Cannana, well known for his experience and skill in the care and management of animals. A commodious apartment had been fitted up in the court-yard of the Consul's house, with one door leading out to a bath. As the winter would have to be passed in Cairo, proper means were employed for making this a warm, or tepid bath. Here then our hippopotamus lived. "he observed of all observers," drinking so many gallons of milk a day (never less than twenty or thirty quarts) that he soon produced a scarcity of that article in Cairo. Nor will this be so much a matter of surprise, when it is considered that they do not understand there the excellent methods of manufacturing enough milk to answer any demand, which obtains with us in London, where such an event as a scarcity of milk was never known by the oldest inhabitant.

Meanwhile active preparations were making for his arrival in Alexandria, to be shipped on board the Ripon steamer. The vessel was furnished with a house on the main-deck, opening by steps down into a tank in the hold, containing four hundred gallons of water. It had been built and fitted up at Southampton from a plan furnished by Mr. Mitchell, Secretary of the Zoological Gardens in the Regent's Park, to whose energies and foresight we are indebted for the safe possession of this grotesque, good-tempered and unique monster. The tank, by various arrangements, they contrived to fill with *fresh* water every other day. A large quantity was taken on board in casks; a fresh supply at Malta: and, besides this, which was by no means enough, they made use of the condensed water of the engines, which amounted to upwards of three hundred gallons per day. As there are some hippotami who enjoy the sea on certain coasts of the world, it is not improbable but our friend would soon have got used to sea-water; but Mr. Mitchell was determined to run no risks, prudently considering that, in the first place, the strength of the salt water, to one whose mother had been accustomed, and her ancestors for generations, to the mild streams of Nilus, might disagree with "young pickle;" and secondly, if he chanced to take to it amazingly, how would he bear the change when he arrived at his mansion in the Regent's Park. Fresh water, therefore, was provided for his bath every other day throughout the voyage.

The British Consul began to prepare for the departure of his noble guest at the end of April; and on the early part of May, the Consul took an affectionate leave of him, and would have embraced him, but that the extraordinary girth of his body rendered such a demonstration impossible.

So, our hippopotamus departed from Grand Cairo in a large padded cart. He had refused a very nice horse-box which the Consul had provided for him. Some feeling about his dignity, we suppose; though Hamet Safi Cannana considered the objection arose from a certain care of his skin, which might have got a little chafe or hard rub in the horse-box. It was a lesson to Mr. Murray for life. No effort, of course, was made to compel the great personage to enter this machine, because it is one of Hamet's principles of management never to irritate an animal—always to keep him in good temper—never directly and immediately to thwart his will in any thing that is not injurious, impracticable, or particularly unreasonable. Very delightful all this! Who would not be a hippopotamus? Who that was not Cæsar, would not wish to be Pompey?

On arriving at Alexandria, full ten thousand people rushed out into the streets to see our hippopotamus pass. If no one had ever seen the amphibious prodigy in Cairo, it is not to be wondered at that the mental condition of Alexandria was in the same lamentable degree of darkness.

The crowd was so great, that the British Consul (whose feelings had so mastered him on taking leave of his guest that he had been obliged to follow the *cortege*) was under the necessity of applying to the Governor of Alexandria for an escort of troops. This was forthwith granted, and down they came galloping along the streets of Alexandria, with waving scimetars! It was well the hippopotamus did not see them from his padded cart, where he lay asleep—it might have caused a little misunderstanding.

Order being restored, and a great lane made in the crowd, Hamet Safi Cannana commenced the gradual and delicate process of awaking the great personage. In the course of an hour or so, during which time the escort of soldiers all "stood attention," the excited feelings of the anxious lane of population were gratified by the sight of the Arab ceremoniously advancing in gentleman-usher fashion, while close behind him slowly lounged the hippopotamus.

He embarked on board the Ripon, where he was soon joined by his Excellency General Jung Bahadoor Ranajee and the Nepaulese princes, his brothers. These latter personages would have been great objects of attraction under any other circumstances: but what could stand against such a rival as the occupant of the great house and bath on the main-deck?

During the voyage "our fat friend" attached himself yet more strongly to his attendant and interpreter, Hamet; indeed, the devotion to his person which this assidious and thoughtful person had manifested from his first promotion to the office, had been of a kind to secure such a result from any one at all accessible to kindly affections. Hamet had commenced by sleeping side by-side with his charge in the house at Cairo, and adopted the same arrangement for the night during the first week of the voyage to England. Finding, however, as the weather grew warmer, and the hippopotamus bigger and bigger, that this was attended with some inconvenience, Hamet had a hammock slung from the beams immediately over the place where he used to sleep—in fact, just over his side of the bed—by which means he was raised two or three feet above his usual position. Into this hammock got Hamet, and having assured the hippopotamus, both by his voice, and by extending one arm over the side so as to touch him, that he was there as usual at his side, and "all was right," he presently fell asleep. How long he slept Hamet does not know, but he was awoke by the sensation of a jerk and a hoist, and found himself laying on the bed in his old place, close beside our fat friend. Hamet tried the experiment once more: but the same thing again occurred. No sooner was he asleep than the hippopotamus got up—raised his broad nose beneath the heaviest part of the hammock that swung lowest, and by an easy and adroit toss, pitched Hamet clean out. After this, Hamet, acting on his rule never thwarting his charge in anything reasonable, abandoned the attempt of a separate bed, and took up his nightly quarters by his side as before.

As for the voyage it was passed pleasantly enough by the most important of the illustrious strangers on board. His Excellency the Nepaulese ambassador, together with the prince his brother, were uncommonly sea sick; but as for our fat friend, he enjoyed himself all the way. He liked his bath, for which there was no lack of fresh water supplies, and his provisions were equally satisfactory. Two cows and ten goats had been taken on board for his sole use and service; these, however, not being found sufficient for a "growing youth," the ship's cow was confiscated for the use of his table; and this addition, together with we forget how many sacks of Indian corn meal, enabled him to reach our shores in excellent health and spirits.

A word as to the title of "river-horse," when taken in conjunction with his personal appearance, his habits, and his diet. The hippopotamus has nothing in common with the horse; he seems to us rather an aquatic pig, or a four-footed land porpoise. In fact, he appears to partake of the wild boar, the bull, and the porpoise—the latter predominating at present, but when he gets his tusks, we much fear there will be an alteration in his manners for the worse. As to his eventual size, the prospect is alarming. He is at present only seven months old and he will continue growing till he is fifteen years of age. What news for the London cows!

Arrived at Southampton, our hippopotamus house and all, with Hamet Safi Cannana at his side was hoisted up at the vessel's yard-arm, and gradually lowered upon a great iron truck, which was then wheeled off to the railway station. The whole concern was deposited in the special carriage of a special train, and on this he travelled from Southampton to London. He arrived at the Zoological Gardens in the Regent's Park at ten o'clock at night, and found Lord Brougham, Professor Owen, Thomas Bell, and Mr. Mitchell all waiting (we believe they were not in court dresses) to receive him. They were presently joined by the learned Editor of the "Annals of Natural History," the learned Editor of the "Zoologist," in company with Mr. Van Voorst and several artists who made sketches by the light of a lanthorn. Doyle Wolff, Harrison Weir Foster, (for the "Illustrated London News") and others, were all in assidious attendance, watchful of every varying outline. The illustrious stranger descended from his carriage, and entered the gardens. First went the lanthorn; then Hamet Safi Cannana with a bag of dates slung over his shoulder; and after him slowly lounged our uncouth treasure, with a prodigy of a grin such as he alone can give, expressive of his humorous sense of all the honors and luxuries that awaited him.

We understand it is a cabinet secret that the Pasha has ordered a fresh party of hunting soldiers to proceed up the river, as far as the White Nile, to search for another young hippopotamus—a female! We may, therefore, look forward to the unrivalled fame of possesing a royal pair—"sure *such* a pair" as were never yet seen in any collection of Natural History—to say nothing of the chance of a progeny. These are national questions,—why should they be cabinet secrets?

We are certainly a strange people—we English. Our indefatigable energies and matchless wealth often exhibit themselves in eccentric fancies. No wonder, foreigners—philosophers and all—are so much puzzled what to make of us. They point to the unaided efforts of a Waghorn, and to his widow's pension-mite—and then they point to our hippopotamus! Truly, it is not easy to reply to the inference, and impossible to evade it. We have had a Chaucer and a Milton, a Hobbes, and a Newton, a Watt and a Winsor; and we have had other great poets, and philosophers, and machinists, and men of learning and science, and have several of each now living among us: but any amount of a people's anxious interest, which the present state of popular education induces, is very limited indeed compared to that which is felt by all classes for a Tom Thumb, a Jim Crow, or our present Idol. Howbeit, as the last is really a great improvement on the two former fascinating exotics, it is to be hoped that we shall, in course of time, more habitually display some kind of discrimination in the objects of our devotion.—*Household Words.*

THE (London) *Inquirer* copies from the pages of a new work, just published in England, a story of a slave which tends to prove that Slavery is the same everywhere, notwithstanding the common impression in regard to that of the East:—

"During the early time of my residence with Sitt Madoula, before I was considered part of the family, I went to see her one morning, and found her in conversation with a tall, handsome black girl, wrapped in a white melayah, or mantle. The Sitt reclined in the corner of her divan, smoking a shisheh, whilst the girl stood at a little distance with her hands meekly crossed. After the usual compliments, I was told that this was a slave belonging to a Turkish lady just arrived with her suite from Algiers, to meet her husband, who, however, had gone on to Stamboul leaving word that she was to follow. As, however, he had forgotten likewise to leave money enough to defray the expenses of the journey, it seemed quite natural to the lady to dispose of one of her handmaidens, and accordingly this one had been selected. Zarifeh herself was telling the story as I entered; and although it did not seem to occur to her that she was the victim of a most unjust system, she could not help expressing her regret at being thus suddenly thrown out of the bosom of one family to seek for a place in another, or rather to take the place which chance might assign her. I elicited the fact that, although her mistress sometimes beat her even for talking in her sleep and for being frightened on board of the vessel in which they had coasted the whole north of Africa, yet, considering all things, she had been happy with her. Here, then, was one instance in which the much-vaunted kindness with which the Orientals treat their slaves was turned into a weapon of torture to them. The stronger they are bound by ties of affection to their owners, the more cruelly are their feelings wounded when the vicissitudes of their servile life throw them into the market. Struck by this circumstance, I afterwards made inquiries and found that instances in which slaves remain attached to one family throughout their existence are comparatively rare. If misfortune overtakes a man, of course the slaves are sold; they go as part of the property in the case of failure, for example: and how many Egyptian merchants have not failed—once, twice, thrice! On the first pressure of pecuniary difficulties, one at least of the slaves of the house is got rid of. 'I have so much in my shop,' you may often hear it said; 'I have built so and so: and I have the donkey and Zara!'

"Zarifeh tried hard poor thing, to persuade my friend to buy her; she walked about, to show that she was active; arranged the cushions of the divan, and trimmed the shisheh, to exhibit her familiarity with the usages of a genteel house; and laughed with forced gaiety, to prove that she was of a good temper. There was a ground of objection, however, which the Sitt suspected, and the truth of which she endeavored to ascertain by a series of sudden questions and artful cross-examinations; but Zarifeh denied with well-feigned indignation the double life of which she was not permitted to be proud.'

"The chief difficulty, however, still remained. Would two days of trial be allowed? 'Unless they are,' said Madoula to the girl, 'I shall not buy you. How do I know what bad habits you may have? You have acknowledged you talk in your sleep. I don't care for that, as you will be shut up at night; but you may be a liar, you may be a thief, you may ——' And here followed a list of vices incident to female slaves, during the utterance of which I scarcely knew whether to look at the ceiling or the floor, but to which poor Zarifeh listened most patiently, firmly denying that she possessed such habits and imperfections."

Eventually, Zarifeh was dismissed, not because the mistress feared her being guilty of any of these faults, but for a quite opposite reason, namely, that she was supposed to be too clever. "She was," says Mr. St. John, "in the Eastern style, a refined and well-educated woman." The next candidate was of a very different class: after expatiating to her European guest, at great length on the tricks of slave-dealers, and closing with the pious ejaculation "May misfortune come to them!" the Levantine matron suddenly turned to one of the girls, who stood with the rest, huddled in a corner, and, "*cursing her race*, ordered her, in an insulting manner, to come forward:"—

"It is impossible to describe the expression of rage and hatred which shot, like a lightning flash, athwart the face of the girl, who thus, in an unguarded moment, betrayed that she still possessed all the wild untamed feelings of her native wilds. I looked at once with interest upon her; for that glance revealed that not all the ill-treatment and suffering to which she had been subjected during a journey of thousands of miles, over deserts which we should consider it a mighty triumph to traverse, had broken her spirit and rendered her insensible to injury. To my mind, such a character would recommend itself. The readiest to resent ill-usage are often the most susceptible of kindly impressions. But this young savage was at once judged by my prudent friend, who dismissed her to join her companions below, and applauded her own keen appreciation of character on beholding the look of scorn and defiance, that would have become a princess, with which she gathered her rags about her and walked away.

"'Now come you here, child of the Devil,' said Sitt Madoula to the remaining girl, who, with a stupified yet anxious gaze, had watched the scene I have described. She approached, or rather crept forward, keeping her eyes on those of the Sitt, who was a right good soul at bottom, and expressed to me, in broken Italian, her sorrow at being obliged to put on an appearance of harshness. I need not repeat the conversation that ensued; suffice it to say that it was satisfactory. The girl was very ignorant and apparently good-natured. But the worthy Sitt would not trust to appearances; she had a whole host of little expedients for diving into the recesses of the human heart.

"'Give me your hand, Zara,' said she, choosing one of the half-dozen names commonly bestowed on slaves.

"The girl obeyed. Sitt Madoula took the thin hand held out to her, looked rather awkwardly at me for a moment, and then spat in it! I started and uttered an exclamation.

"'*Stato tranquillo!*' quoth she to me aside in her *lingua Franca*. 'Be quiet: it is the custom. What do you call that in your country, Zara?'

"The girl looked perplexed; but if she was offended, she kept down her resentment in the very lowest depths of her heart. Her reply was, in a tone of angelic meekness, 'I know the name of it in Arabic, O lady!'

"Sitt Madoula blushed scarlet. The unintended rebuke told. She let fall the slaves hand, and said, 'You are a good girl, and very learned. I shall pay your price. Don't look angry, O Frank,' she added, turning to me with some confusion: 'you know I mean to be kind to her. Anybody else would have struck her on the mouth with a slipper; but I am not so cruel.'"

THE SULKS.

IN Christopher North's new series of articles in Blackwood, entitled, 'Christopher under Canvas,' we find the following capital picture of a boy: a bit of autobiography that is well worth quoting.

'I hereby authorize the boys of this Empire to have what tempers they choose with one sole exception—The Sulks. Once and once only, during one of the longest and best spent lives on record, was I in the mood described, and it endured most of a whole day. The anniversary of that day I always observe, in severest solitude, with a salutary horror. And it is my birth-day. Ask me not, my friends, to reveal the cause. Aloof from confession before men, we must keep to ourselves, as John Foster says, a corner of our own souls. A black corner it is; and enter it with or without a light you see here or there, something dismal, hideous, shapeless, nameless, each lying in its own place on the floor. There lies the cause. It was the morning of my ninth year. As I kept sitting high up stairs by myself, one family face after another kept ever and anon looking at me, all with one expression. And one familiar voice after another all with one tone kept muttering at me, 'He's in his sulks!' How I hated them with an intense hatred, and chiefly them I had loved best, at each opening and each shutting of that door. How I hated myself as my blubbered face grew hotter; and I knew how ugly I must be, with my fixed fiery eyes; it was painful to sit on such a chair for hours in one posture, and to have chained a child would have been great cruelty. But I was resolved to die rather than change it; and had I been told by any one under an angel to get up and go to play, I would have spit in his face. It was a lonesome attic, and I had the fear of ghosts; but not then, my superstitious fancy was quelled by my troubled heart. Had I not deserved to be allowed to go? Could any one of them give a reason for not allowing me to go? What right had they to say that if I did go I should never be able to find my way, by myself back? What right had they to say that Roundy was a blackguard, and that he would lead me to the gallows? Never before in all the world had a good boy been so used on his birth day. They pretend to be sorry when I am sick: and when I say my prayers, they say theirs too; but I am sicker now, and they are not sorry, but angry: there is no use in prayers, and I won't read one verse in my Bible this night, should my aunt go down on her knees." And in the midst of such unworded soliloquies did the young blasphemer fall asleep.

'I know not how long I slept, but on waking I saw an angel with a most beautiful face and most beautiful hair—a little young angel—about the same size as myself, sitting on a stool at my feet. 'Are you quite well now Christopher? Let us go to the meadow and gather flowers.' Shame, sorrow, remorse, contrition, came to me with those innocent words: we wept together, and I was comforted. 'I have been sinful.' 'But you are forgiven!' Down the stairs hand in hand we glided, and there was no longer anger in my eyes; the whole house was happy. All voices were kinder, if that were possible, than they had been when I rose in the morning a boy in his ninth year. Parental hands smoothed my hair, parental lips kissed it, and parental greetings, only a little more cheerful than prayers, restored me to the love I had never lost, and which I felt now had animated that brief and just displeasure. Never has Christopher been in his sulks since that day.—Beyond doubt I was that day possessed with a devil; and an angel it was that drove him out.'

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

SIR ROBERT PEEL'S will has been proved and the property sworn under £500,000. Sir Robert has left specific directions for the immediate publication of his Political Memoirs under the editorship of Lord Mahon and Mr. Cardwell.

——A PRETENDER TO THE BRITISH CROWN.—There is, as we learn from his organ, the *Guardian*, of New York (forwarded to us by post), a pretender to the British Crown yet living in the United States. In an address "to the inhabitants of the British realm," he informs them that, having sent a copy of his *Guardian* to legislators and editors of this country in 1849, "the necessary steps were taken by the cabinet in London to recede from dangerous positions," the Queen and Lord John perceiving that the pretender had his eye upon them! "Twice has he interposed between the iniquitous conspiratory proceedings engendered under the Coburg interests and the safety of the civilized world. Adroit emissaries and agencies have long been and continue too powerful to permit him to visit Great Britain until a protective organization shall exist there." But "the legal representative of our ancient sovereigns will yet be with us, supported by the highest intelligence of our nobility, and sustained by the warm hearts and ready hands of a Christian and a conservative world." We have *only* to enrol 480,000 men in Great Britain Ireland, and reprint the *Guardian* for the innoculation of the army and navy, and then our rightful sovereign, "William III. *de jure*," may safely come over the Atlantic, and place himself at our head. "Triennial parliaments," and "extinction of the national debt" are his majesty's watchwords: and should it be necessary to oppose by force "the iniquitous organization in Great Britain, existing under the human vampires of the world," he will "assert our rights upon the battle-field," and conquer in our behalf, or the hand which now guides the pen shall be co-mingled with the dust." What part will "the Noodles" take, on the arrival of this "American gentleman," the "representative of the Stuart family?" Every thing hinges upon that question; and the queen will naturally be anxious until it is satisfactorily decided. Should they declare for "William III. *de jure*," her Majesty and Prince Albert may pack up their carpet bags, and take the first packet for New York.—*Gateshead Observer.*

——HOW THE NEGROES OF ANTIGUA RECEIVED THEIR FREEDOM.—For many reasons Antigua is, to the philanthropist, one of the most interesting of the numerous islands forming the West India group. It was there that Slavery may be said to have been first abolished in the British West India possessions, inasmuch as the colonial legislature of Antigua at once rejected the apprenticeship system, and at once adopted entire emancipation. This was in 1834. When the clock began to strike the hour of twelve o'clock on the last night in the month of July, 1834, the thirty thousand negroes of Antigua were all slaves, slaves in every sense of the word, the property of others. When it had ceased to sound, they were all freemen, freemen under every meaning of that term, unfettered even by the apprenticeship, and at liberty to do what they chose with themselves and their powers of labor. Surely this was a stupendous, and therefore an interesting change. During my stay in Antigua I had many conversations on the subject, and heard many highly interesting details regarding it from men of all shades of opinion as well as color. In particular, I enjoyed the privilege of hearing, from his own mouth, the views and opinions of the able and influential gentleman who moved the bill for rejecting the apprenticeship system and adopting immediate emancipation; and all, and no one more emphatically than the talented Dr. —— himself, concurred in describing the scene as calculated to excite feelings of the deepest interest. That the adoption of immediate emancipation, instead of taking advantage of the intermediate measure, called or miscalled the apprentice system, was a matter purely of policy and expediency, unconnected with feelings of morality or of religion, will not, it is presumed, be denied by any one. But the manner in which the boon was received by the negro population unquestionably reflects great credit on them, or on their advisers and leaders. The 31st of July, 1834, was a Thursday, and the evening of that day saw nearly the whole grown-up negro population of the island of Antigua in the houses of prayer, engaged in religious exercises, chiefly of praise and thanksgiving. In the Wesleyan meeting-house, in the town of St. John's, when the bell of the cathedral began to toll the hour of midnight, the hour that was to set them free, the whole audience sank on their knees, and continued thus to receive the blessed boon of freedom, until the last note had been tolled; when they rose to express their gratitude to God and their rejoicings to each other. Few, whatever may be their views on the general question of emancipation, will deny either the interest or the impressiveness of such a scene. The coming day, Friday, we also devoted to religious exercises throughout the greater part of the island, as also was Saturday, and, as a matter of course, Sunday. So that Monday the 4th of August, 1834, was the first day on which the negro population on any part of the British colonial possessions worked as freemen, entirely and finally emancipated. It argues well for the negroes and their religious instructors, and is generally conceded by the planters in the island of Antigua, that on no previous occasion had the workers on their different estates turned out better than they did, when thus, for the first time, called upon to labor at their occupation without the dread of the lash, in the event of their now refusing so to do.—*Baird's Impressions of the West Indies and North America in* 1849

——A DOMINIE'S LOVE LETTER.—NUTHURST, Nov. 1st, 1816. *Esteemed Friend:* I embrace the present opportunity of addressing these few lines unto thee, hoping they will find thee in good health, which leaves me the same, thank my God! Respected P. I have often told thee I don't much like illustrating my sentiments by correspondence, but I write with a majestic air of animation and delight when I communicate my thoughts to one that I love beyond description. yes! to one that is virtuous, innocent, and unblemishable! which has a comely behaviour, a loving disposition, and a goodly principle. And thou the person! charming fair one, which may flashy boast of thy virtue, and laugh at others' aspersion. Dear P. when I reflect on all thy amiable qualities, and fond endearments, I am charmingly exalted, and amply satisfied. My senses are more stimulated with love, and every wish gives thee a congratulation. Amiable P. I've meditated on our former accompaniments, and been wonderfully dignified at thine condescending graces. I, in particular, admire thy good temper, and thy relentful forgiveness. For when we have partook of a walk together, some trifling idea has exasperated my disposition, and rendered my behaviour ungenerous and disreputable. Thou, like a benevolent friend, soothed the absurd incensement, and instantly resuscitated our respective amarousness, and doubly exaggerated our beloved enamours. While above all others I thee regard, and while love is spontaneously imprinted in our hearts, let it have its unbounded course. Loving friend, I was more than a little gratified that thou wrote to thy mistress, which was thy duty, for she has been thy peculiar friend, and gave thee competent admonition. She is a faithful monitor, and a well-wisher to thine everlasting welfare. I was absolutely grieved when I heard of thee not being well, and completely fretted that I was aloof, and could not sympathize with thine inconsolitary moments. I candidly hope thy cough is better, and I earnestly desire that our absence may be immediately transformed into lasting presence, that we may enjoy our fond hopes and loving embraces. My dear, the last Sunday that I was at Bevington, I parted with thee about four o'clock; and I stopped in the market-place looking at the soldiers parading, and hearkening the band playing till about six o'clock; then I proceeded on my nightly excursion. I called at the public-house, and was spouting a